

James E. Lawson, O945705.
 William F. Lawson, Jr., O1296395.
 Robert H. Lehman, O1101913.
 Bernard J. Leu, Jr., O2033055.
 John W. Liddle, O2033789.
 Leon H. Lockhart, O1576307.
 John Lycas, O446927.
 Paul D. MacGarvey, O1010491.
 Robert T. Mallheau, O2027263.
 Merritt P. Martin, O1583333.
 Robert J. Martin, O2017423.
 Billy M. McCarver, O1541005.
 Milton E. McCaig, O955486.
 Leo C. McCarthy, O1291497.
 Sam Meadow, O1578348.
 Jack M. Meiss, O1081084.
 Jack R. Metzdorf, O1030909.
 Warren H. Metzner, O1326291.
 Douglas A. Mollison, O1399556.
 Keith L. Monroe, O1063042.
 Fred S. Moore, O1109534.
 William J. Morrisroe, O1062420.
 Paul A. Morton, O425659.
 Albert R. Moses, O1334610.
 James J. Murnane, O1588194.
 Francis J. Murphy, O1047696.
 Irvin E. Nachman, O956241.
 Marvin L. Nance, O1338116.
 Orrin D. Neff, O1342344.
 Louis J. North, O1329038.
 Richard C. O'Connor, O1329152.
 Wade H. Padgett, Jr., O449809.
 David W. Passell, O2088676.
 Arthur G. Pendleton, O451462.
 Jack G. Penick, O2050601.
 Edgar L. Petty, Jr., O955776.
 Milton B. Phillips, O551528.
 John J. Policastro, O1049307.
 Gilbert Procter, Jr., O547892.
 Nicholas G. Psaki, O413264.
 George W. Pulliam, Jr., O552791.
 George P. Ramsey, Jr., O959185.
 James C. Ramsey, O956441.
 Albert Redman, Jr., O1648811.
 Daniel J. Renneisen, O1001217.
 Oliver L. Robbins, O1296258.
 Robert S. Robbins, O2006257.
 John F. Rogan, O1282407.
 Warren J. Rosengren, O2042889.
 John P. Ruppert, O403057.
 Gerald F. Ruschmeyer, O1165444.
 Donald P. Rush, O1636575.
 David C. Russell, O1341907.
 Robert C. Russell, O1046633.
 Hans G. Ruthe, O1117023.
 Bernard B. Sapp, O1169721.
 Edward W. Sargeant, O957444.
 Louis T. Schaner, O1338134.
 Wittmer I. Schleh, O1281336.
 Edgar B. Sharpe, O1648490.
 Charles J. Shoemaker, Jr., O1314964.
 Paul L. Skogsberg, O407739.
 Dillon Snell, O957411.
 George Snipan, O949077.
 Jack W. Stallings, Jr., O1341374.
 James K. Stringer, O554215.
 Leslie J. Swope, O926460.
 Loren H. Sylvester, O953864.
 Douglas B. Tucker, O1327588.
 Joseph R. Ulatoski, O1340833.
 William D. Van Buskirk, O885037.
 Miles C. Vaughan, Jr., O1332443.
 Homer L. Walker, O1341487.
 Richard H. Ward, O1296303.
 William B. Ware, O487923.
 Milton D. Weeks, O455175.
 Seymour T. Weissner, O1825656.
 Thomas R. Westermann, O446550.
 David D. Whiteside, O1000888.
 Charles H. Whitledge, O1119594.
 Kingston M. Winget, O1341060.
 Sanford H. Winston, O442715.
 Dean R. Woodward, O954294.
 Robert D. Worthen, O1555932.
 John D. Yarbrough, O948179.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Rev. Father C. E. Farrelly, of Emmetsburg, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

O Almighty and Eternal Father, master of the universe, creator of heaven and earth, giver of life and all things pertaining to it, look down, we beseech Thee, in benediction upon Thy children gathered here this afternoon.

We beg Thy blessing, O Lord, upon our beloved America. From the depths of our hearts we beseech Thee to grant that she may always enjoy peace, security, and freedom from harm. May she always be protected by Thy mighty arm from her enemies, both within and without her borders.

We pray Thee, O God, that the light of Thy divine wisdom may direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government; so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of happiness, the increase of industry, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PROTECTION OF CANVAS AND WATER-PROOF RUBBER FOOTWEAR

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as further indication of the alarm felt in my district over the current threat to the rubber-footwear industry, I have received the following letter from the Massachusetts Federation of Labor:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR,
 Boston, Mass., April 18, 1950.
 Representative ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
 House Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN—
 RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR, APRIL 5, 1950

Whereas a bill is pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs," which would eliminate what is known as the American selling-price principle, specifically as it applies to canvas and waterproof rubber footwear;

Whereas the State Department has under consideration negotiations which would result in reciprocal trade agreements lowering present tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear imported from foreign countries;

Whereas any further reduction in the tariff rates applying to imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear would constitute a serious threat to the major industry of our community and to other local business firms and would result in the loss of jobs, widespread distress, increase of relief rolls, and increase of the tax burden of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor at its monthly meeting, held Wednesday, April 5, 1950, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and all Senators and Congressmen from the New England States, to take necessary action to prevent any reduction in the tariff on imports of canvas and waterproof footwear whether it be by legislative enactment abrogating the American selling-price principle, by negotiation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, and Senators and Congressmen from the New England States.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY J. BRIDES, President,
 KENNETH J. KELLEY,
 Secretary-Treasurer-Legislative Agent.

HIDDEN TAXES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering the omnibus appropriation bill. It is a big one. Big appropriations mean high taxes. To keep our country solvent, balance the budget, and reduce taxes we must cut appropriations to the bone. The following is a list of some of the hidden taxes which millions of Americans are paying every hour of the day:

Quart of milk, 13 cents; taxes, 8 cents.
 Loaf of bread, 10 cents; taxes, 5 cents.
 Pack of cigarettes, 8 cents; taxes, 11 cents.

Meat, 50 cents; taxes, 20 cents.
 Cake of soap, 5 cents; taxes, 2 cents.
 Can of baby powder, 29 cents; taxes, 18 cents.

Movies, 40 cents; taxes, 20 cents.
 Telephone, \$4; taxes, \$2.
 Television, \$400; taxes, \$70.
 New house, \$7,000; taxes, \$3,000.
 Rent, \$40; taxes, \$20.
 Light, \$3.25; taxes, \$1.75.
 Refrigerator, \$150; taxes, \$75.
 Coal, \$13; taxes, \$7.
 Clock, \$2; taxes, \$1.
 Automobile, \$1,400; taxes, \$700.
 Gasoline, 14 cents; taxes, 11 cents.
 Tire, \$15; taxes, \$3.
 Battery, \$15.59; taxes, \$2.36.
 Lawn mower, \$14; taxes, \$7.
 Railroad ticket, \$12.75; taxes, \$2.25.
 Perfume, \$9.75; taxes, \$2.45.
 Hosiery, \$1; taxes, 50 cents.
 Shoes, \$6; taxes, \$3.
 Purse, \$10; taxes, \$5.
 Camera, \$11.23; taxes, \$1.77.

If we are wise we will economize in government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARSALIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Charles D. Fogle, general counsel for the Ohio Oil and Gas Association.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspaper articles.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a letter written by Mr. Gordon M. Jones, president of Row, Peterson & Co., of Evanston, Ill., to the Secretary of Labor.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 133]

Allen, Calif.	Harris	Pfeifer,
Allen, La.	Harrison	Joseph L.
Barden	Hart	Poage
Barrett, Pa.	Harvey	Powell
Battle	Havener	Quinn
Bennett, Fla.	Heffernan	Rains
Blackney	Hill	Ribicoff
Boykin	Hobbs	Rivers
Buckley, N. Y.	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Bulwinkle	Irving	Roosevelt
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Sabath
Carroll	Jensen	Sasser
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, N. C.	Shelley
Cavalcante	Kelly, N. Y.	Short
Celler	Keogh	Smathers
Chatham	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Chelf	Klein	Smith, Ohio
Christopher	Kunkel	Stanley
Cole, Kans.	McCulloch	Tackett
Colmer	McDonough	Tauriello
Cox	McGregor	Thompson
Crosser	McKinnon	Tollefson
Davenport	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Davis, N. Y.	Macy	Underwood
Dawson	Mansfield	Velde
DeGraffenried	Miles	Walter
Douglas	Miller, Md.	Whitaker
Doyle	Monroney	White, Calif.
Engel, Mich.	Moulder	White, Idaho
Engle, Calif.	Murdock	Wickersham
Fellows	Murphy	Wilson, Ind.
Gamble	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Okla.
Gilmer	Nixon	Wilson, Tex.
Granger	Norton	Withrow
Grant	O'Brien, Mich.	Wood
Green	O'Hara, Ill.	Woodhouse
Gwinn	O'Neill	Young
Hall,		
Leonard W.	Patten	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TAXATION OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 371) to correct the formula used in com-

puting the income taxes of life insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. LYNCH, GREGORY, CAMP, FORAND, REED of New York, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and KEAN.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, 1951, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement entered into yesterday, general debate on chapters I and II has been concluded.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment beginning with chapter I.

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$11,000,000, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), \$1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$11,000,000" and insert "\$9,800,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to cut down the amount that is paid by the Federal Government as a contribution to the District of Columbia. The legislative authorization is for \$12,000,000. If this amendment be adopted they will receive \$10,800,000.

In justification for a payment by the Federal Government toward the operating expenses of the District of Columbia, it is set forth that there is so much exempt property in the District of Columbia belonging to the Federal Government that it would place an undue burden upon the taxpayers of the District of Columbia unless there were a very substantial Federal contribution.

Let us see what the facts are. The tax rate on real estate in the District of Columbia runs \$17, \$18, \$19 a thousand. I do not remember the exact figure. The tax rate in almost every community which the Members of the House of Representatives represent runs from \$35 to \$40 a thousand. We have at home also not only State income taxes, taxes of all other descriptions, but we also have at least double the amount of taxation

on a thousand dollars of property that exists here in the District of Columbia. In addition to that we have all sorts of exemptions for public buildings, including Federal buildings, all sorts of colleges, State institutions for the insane, educational institutions, State penal institutions, and so forth. We also have in a great many communities Federal institutions on a very large scale. There is not very much more exempt property in proportion to the total here in the District than there is in most of our own districts. Under these circumstances it seems to me absolutely ridiculous that we should have a Federal contribution of \$12,000,000 to the District.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It seems to me that in 1948 we passed legislation that rather fixed the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia at \$12,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It authorized an appropriation of that amount of money. We have had authorizations at various times and we have not at some times appropriated the full amount. We have had all sorts of authorizations, but we have to base the amount we shall carry and approach the authorization on the basis of what we are able to pay. At the present time we are in this situation: According to the announcement made by the Senator from Georgia on yesterday as the result of a study of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, we are facing a Federal deficit of upwards of \$6,500,000,000 with a likelihood that it will run to a larger amount than that with a little more unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with the rising unemployment there are estimates in the paper this morning that the deficit might be seven and one-half billion and next year it might be \$10,000,000,000. It does not seem to me that the people of the District of Columbia should be set off in an exempted class and not be treated the way we are obliged to treat other communities of the country and other agencies and activities of the Government. In order to try to cut down expenses in some way or other I have proposed here a very modest and a very moderate cut, not as big as we have made in some of the governmental agencies.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe also that the sales tax this Congress passed for the District brings in between \$11,000,000 and \$12,000,000 a year.

Mr. TABER. I believe it does.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And if the Federal contribution stays the same, they will get \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000 more than they ordinarily had.

Mr. TABER. On top of that the liquor taxes were increased, but they are still nowhere near so much as they are in most States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. There is nothing sacrosanct about this \$12,000,000 appropriation, is there? Is it not simply an authorization?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Each year it has to be passed on by the Committee on Appropriations; is that not right?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Now, would the gentleman tell us this? I share the gentleman's view about the assessed value in Washington being entirely out of proportion with what it is in most other communities, including my own.

Mr. TABER. I expect the gentleman's is at least 100 percent.

Mr. KEATING. Well, it is close to it.

Mr. TABER. Mine is.

Mr. KEATING. The rate is \$30 or more, if you add everything in. Now, can the gentleman tell us how much is yielded to the District for each dollar increase in assessed value or, conversely, if the gentleman's amendment carries, how much of an increase in the assessed value of the District would be required to offset the \$1,200,000 saving?

Mr. TABER. \$1,200,000 would be approximately nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total District budget, and the increase in tax to cover that amount would probably be, I imagine—I am just guessing at it—perhaps 30 cents on the dollar.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. When was this amount increased to \$12,000,000?

Mr. TABER. A couple of years ago.

Mr. REES. For a long while it was about five, six, or seven million dollars, was it not?

Mr. TABER. For a long time it was \$5,500,000, and then for a time it was a little more. But, a couple of years ago it was increased to about \$12,000,000.

Mr. REES. In other words, we are doubling the contribution as against what it was as many as 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. TABER. Well, practically doubling it; yes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. What, really, does this \$12,000,000 represent? Is it a subsidy of some kind?

Mr. TABER. It is a subsidy to the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, it is significant that at the time it was increased our fiscal situation was quite different from what it is today.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. And, our fiscal situation is getting worse and

worse, and there is not any reason why the people back home should carry the whole of that big burden. We should pass it around and pass our reductions around instead of making fish of one and fowl of another.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES. It was the understanding, I believe, of quite a number of Members of the House that when we passed the Sales Tax Act it would take care of approximately \$12,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct. And, I think it has.

Mr. REES. And that would prevent the necessity of increasing this contribution.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Will the gentleman tell me how his amendment would affect the contribution of \$1,000,000 toward the water rate?

Mr. TABER. I made it to the \$1,000,000, which is the out and out contribution to the District.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. So it would not affect the other item?

Mr. TABER. It would not affect the water item. I did not touch that because I thought we might just as well take it out of the large item. The whole cut is on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This is the first amendment that we have now to the over-all omnibus appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It would seem to me that as we go along and offer these amendments the House should certainly back up the gentleman from New York and others who offer them, if we are ever going to hope to economize to any degree whatsoever. I think the people of America want and need economy. At least, that is what I found out when I was back home this past week.

Mr. TABER. If the Congress of the United States has no sense of its own responsibility to the people and is not willing to take the responsibility of reducing those things that can be reduced and reduced fairly, not making fish of one and fowl of another, I fear for the solvency of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the efforts of the gentleman from New York to attain as much economy as we can. I think I am as strong for it as he is, but I think we have to use some discretion about it and some discrimination.

I rise for the purpose of giving you a little of the background of this \$12,000,000 authorization for the District of Columbia because I happen to know something about it. I was chairman of the subcommittee of the District Committee in charge of fiscal affairs. We found that the fiscal affairs of the District were in very bad shape, so we worked out a full program.

As you know, this matter of the Federal contribution has been one of dispute for many years. In the first place, the original law was that the Federal Government contribute 50 percent of the cost of running the District of Columbia. That was varied from time to time, and, finally, in recent years it got down, I think, as low as \$8,000,000. I do not believe it ever got down to anything like \$5,000,000.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, for a long time it was \$5,500,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

As a part of this program of putting the District of Columbia on a sound fiscal basis, this authorization was made a part of the fiscal policy and written into permanent law in the 1948 Fiscal Act of the District of Columbia.

The gentleman says an authorization is just an authorization. Of course, any act of this Congress does not bind another Congress. Nobody is disputing that. But here was a program that was worked out with the greatest care. In that act of 1948 this language was contained:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and each fiscal year thereafter, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated as the annual payment of the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia the sum of \$12,000,000.

That was for every year, not for that year.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We passed the sales tax since we passed that bill. The sales tax brings in about \$12,000,000 a year. Does not the gentleman feel that the situation might be altered just a little now, since we did give them an additional \$12,000,000 through the sales tax?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not one iota. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the District Committee and knows some of the problems we have had to deal with in the fiscal affairs of the District. That \$12,000,000 annual contribution was a part of the program that went along with the sales tax. As the gentleman knows, Congressman DIRKSEN was chairman of the committee at the time the sales tax was proposed and defeated, and I was chairman of the subcommittee last year when this Congress, under

vigorous opposition, adopted the sales tax and adopted this program for the fiscal affairs of the District.

My good friend has said that when we adopted the sales tax that raised \$12,000,000. Some of you gentlemen here ought to remember why it became so necessary to have a sales tax. This Congress raised the Federal employees all along the line at great cost to the Government. The following year the District employees who had not been included in that act were included. It became necessary to put them on the same basis as other Federal employees. That took \$5,000,000 a year. Congress did that. The District of Columbia did not have anything to do with it. Congress fixed those wages. That is the fact—one of the reasons we had to adopt the sales tax was that we had to pay back \$5,500,000 for the previous year and we had to pay for every year \$5,500,000 for increases in wages, which were very just it is true, and this same Congress did it. Now it is suggested that we back up on the program that was definitely worked out and fixed by the District committees of both the other body and the House of Representatives.

Something has been said about the low taxes of the people in Washington. I happen to know something about that because we had a joint committee of the Senate and House on the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia. We worked on that. We heard all of the evidence about whether the property was fairly assessed here or whether it was not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We worked on that matter for months. We held hearings to hear the testimony. It was said that District property was assessed lower and the taxes were lower than property in the surrounding areas. We did not just get up and say everything is wrong about these assessments. What we did was to send out in the field, both in Maryland and in Virginia, and we took identical houses which were erected in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and undertook to see what the taxes were. The taxes in every instance were higher on individual properties in the District of Columbia than they were in the surrounding territories. There just is not anything to this business about Washingtonians getting by without paying any taxes.

The point I want to make to the House is this: That those of us who have taken some interest in the District's affairs think that we have the budget of the District of Columbia on a sound basis so that they can go ahead with their schools and hospitals and other permanent improvements. Five million of that \$10,000,000 which was raised as a result of the sales tax—it is \$12,000,000 really—but five and one-half million dollars of that has to go to pay the increased wages

of the District employees that the Congress put on the District. The \$5,000,000 has been by common consent allotted over a period of years to do the public-school business and to improve the hospitals and other public institutions here which are so sorely needed. I expect that many of you folks who do not come in contact with these things do not realize the great need here for improvement in some of your institutions in these hospitals, and children's homes, and places of that kind. They really are in a deplorable state. Some of you folks ought to go out and look at some of them. Then you will know why this committee decided, after studying this problem, why we reached the conclusions that we did and arranged this budget so that we could year by year appropriate a sufficient amount of money to take care of these very worth while and very necessary public improvements.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. The distinguished gentleman made the statement that at one time the contribution to the District was 50 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That was the law. That was the basic law.

Mr. JONAS. Then what brought about the downgrade? What made it necessary to reduce it? Was the \$8,000,000 much less than the 50-percent contribution? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, yes; very much less. But the Congress did it because the Congress controls the District and passes the laws governing it.

Mr. JONAS. Then how was the deficit made up?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot tell you over the past years how it was made up, but the District of Columbia does not owe any money.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. YATES. With reference to the percentages that have been requested by the gentleman from Illinois, and with reference to the statement of the \$5,000,000 appropriation which was made by the gentleman from New York, I have here a statement of the percentages of the share of the United States of the appropriation over the past years. In 1938 there was an appropriation of \$5,000,000 only, but that was 12.35 percent of the total cost of government for the District of Columbia. The present \$11,000,000 appropriation will only be 10.66 percent of the total cost of government for the District of Columbia. It is a lower contribution than was made by the Federal Government at the time the appropriation was only \$5,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman has given us that information. I did not have it immediately at hand. Will the gentleman say whether or not over a long period of years that appropriation was ever down as low as five and one-half million?

Mr. YATES. It was, during the depression years of 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938. In subsequent years it remained fairly constant. As a result, the facil-

ities and government of the District of Columbia have had to suffer as a result of not having had sufficient funds.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman, and I hope that you will defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are finally up against the gun. All of us who have written home stating we were for economy and that we believed in a strong financial foundation for this great Nation of ours have now reached the time when we can discharge this responsibility to our people. We can show our sincerity by helping to cut a little of the unnecessary funds out of the thousands of items throughout this big appropriation bill. We are not harming the District of Columbia by asking that the District help this move toward economy by contributing only 1 percent of their budget of about \$120,000,000. That is all this proposed amendment will mean. In my opinion, the Government of the United States will be strengthened if we will cut 10 percent all the way through the entire personnel with one or two exceptions. If we are to economize, we will have to vote to reduce appropriations in which we have direct interest, as well as trying to only cut at the other fellow's expense. While we have a responsibility to our own districts, we must not forget the general over-all picture, and permit the trees to hide the forests in the distance.

Now, let us think it over. Why can we not take 1 percent off this \$119,000,000 District of Columbia budget without doing any harm to this great city of Washington? We could rightfully point out that Washington, D. C., has the greatest influx of tourists of any city in the United States. This city has the greatest cash Federal pay roll in the United States. It has one of the lowest income-tax rates of any of our States. The real-estate tax is very small. Why can the District of Columbia not increase its level of taxation on real estate up somewhat near to what we have in Minneapolis or St. Paul or some of the great cities through the Midwest before they make demands on the other taxpayers of the Nation to pay at least \$5,000,000 of what the local residents should pay?

As I stated, this is the first amendment that will show whether or not we mean business. I hope we will try to do something toward lessening this \$7,000,000 deficit which is a threat to the financial stability of our great Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man on the floor of the House in my support of economy in the Federal budget. I do think, however, that we

should use an intelligent application of effort in where we cut this present enormous budget which is running us into deficit financing to a debt which in a few years will be beyond the ability and means of this country to pay. I say that we should cut this over-all appropriations bill, but no great saving can be made in a relatively small amount of \$1,200,000 which will do so much good, and will mean so very little in the final figures.

As an example, specifically, I believe that this appropriation bill could be trimmed a sizable amount, but the place for intelligent trimming is in the multimillion dollar appropriations for the Army and the Navy. Hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved in these items; but certainly the \$1,200,000 that we are trying to retain here now is poor economy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If we could cut enough of these million-dollar items it would soon add up to an amount that looked impressive.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is a good point except for the fact that this \$1,200,000 is so vitally needed for the purposes for which it is earmarked, and will return so much for the money spent that it is just poor business to cut it.

Now, in regard to this item, this is an amount of money that is paid by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes on the Federal property in the District of Columbia. If the Federal Government paid its just share of taxation it would be over \$16,000,000 instead of \$12,000,000—and we are trying to cut one million off of the twelve.

Since 1936 the taxable area in the District of Columbia has gone down from 56.7 percent to 48.7 percent. This is Government-owned property which has been taken over for Government use, which procedure is entirely justified because the District of Columbia was created for that purpose. But this \$12,000,000 item is only an item to compensate the District for the \$16,000,000 in taxes it otherwise would derive from Government property.

Another reason is that Washington, D. C., is a boom town, just as much so in the last 10 years as any western city has ever been. Its population has increased by over 300,000 people in that time. This means that the District has to have a lot more streets, sidewalks, sewers, schools and the like, and you certainly cannot go ahead and service 300,000 people if you cut down the money that is needed to buy these services. I think this \$12,000,000 item is a bargain in view of the fact the Federal Government would be paying \$4,000,000 more, or a total of \$16,000,000 if it were paying taxes on Government property in the District.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the grounds of the views of my colleague from Oregon, but I also realize that this influx of 300,000 new people should mean 300,000 additional people to help pay the

taxes of the District of Columbia. I do not know how many Members of Congress residing in the District of Columbia pay a personal-property or real-estate tax in the District of Columbia. I do not own real estate here but I do pay a personal-property tax. They did not come and look me up. I asked them to send me a blank so that I could pay the property tax because I was getting the benefits of the city and I therefore felt I should contribute to their costs.

Let me show you this picture. In the District of Columbia the personal-property-tax rate is \$2 a hundred. You have a thousand-dollar exemption. On the same assessed value of personal property here in the District of Columbia on which I am called upon to pay the infinitesimal amount of \$4, in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., on the same amount of personal property, the tax was \$60. Why? Because I only have an exemption of \$200 at home and our tax rate is \$6.57. We pay more for schools in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., than you pay in the entire District here for all public services.

If the District of Columbia is running short of funds to furnish such things as public schools, fire protection, police protection, and all of those things that go to making up a fine municipality, the remedy is right here in the District of Columbia. There is no reason why the taxpayers of the State of Kansas, already burdened to the point where it is almost impossible to pay, should be called upon to pay more and more here until the District of Columbia brings its tax rate up somewhere close to the rate prevailing in the larger cities throughout the United States. When that is done I feel quite sure there will be ample funds in the District of Columbia to provide for themselves everything they need without asking for contributions from the taxpayers of the other 48 States.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. How does the tax rate in the District of Columbia compare with the tax rate of the large cities of the Nation?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not have all of the details but as you can see from the example I have given of my home city the tax rate is over three times what it is here, plus the fact that here there is a thousand-dollar exemption while at home the exemption is only \$200. That makes \$800 more upon which we pay a tax than in the District of Columbia.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman's argument essentially boil down to this: There should be no Federal contribution of any kind in the event the taxes are increased to a sufficient amount to pay the District's total expenses?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; I would not necessarily go that far. I feel that there is a duty to make some contribution, but it should be held to the very lowest min-

imum possible so that it will be just that much lower on the folks at home.

Mr. YATES. What would be the basis of the gentleman's apportionment then?

Mr. SCRIVNER. What is the lowest we have ever contributed?

Mr. YATES. This is among the lowest we have ever contributed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What is the lowest we have ever contributed?

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman want it percentage-wise or by dollars?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am talking about dollars. The people at home do pay dollars and that is what they are interested in.

Mr. YATES. There have been appropriations of \$5,000,000 and that was 12 percent of the budget.

Mr. SCRIVNER. When was that?

Mr. YATES. In 1935, in the heart of the depression. Now, with the \$11,000,000 contribution, \$1,000,000 going to the highway fund, it is a lesser percentage of the cost of the government of the District of Columbia than it was at the time when \$5,000,000 was appropriated.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There has been a great influx of people into the District. While this may be what has been termed a boom town, they do not here have the depressions that we have in other parts of the country because you always have a large number, several thousand Federal employees, who get their pay day in and day out no matter what happens in any industrial city in the United States, such as the one I represent, where we have to depend upon the mills, foundries and packing plants for our income.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. In response to the question that the gentleman from Michigan asked a moment ago, may I say that I made a study of that matter last year when we had the bill up to appropriate \$3,000,000 for the fair that is to be held here next year. I calculated that the tax rate on property in the District of Columbia is about one-fifth what it is in my district.

There is another thing I recall too and that is we put on a sales tax last year which the transients help to pay.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And quite properly so.

Mr. JACOBS. I go along with the gentleman that we should make some contribution because of the property that the Government owns in the District of Columbia, but it does not seem to me that when the District of Columbia tax rate is as low as it is we should be too generous with the money of the folks back home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill and it is very essential that we dispose of it as rapidly as possible, and much to my regret I think

we ought to adhere to the bill before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the request?

Mr. CANNON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York to reduce the appropriation for the District of Columbia by \$1,200,000.

This is a matter to which I gave some attention on other occasions. I favor the proposed cut in this appropriation. I do not understand how Members of this Committee can oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York when, in their own districts, in their own cities, almost anywhere in the country, taxpayers are required to pay a much higher rate of tax than in the District of Columbia. It may be said by some Members, that the tax valuation is a little different, but the small difference in valuation will not make up for the favoritism that is given to those who pay taxes in the District of Columbia. In our particular community we pay two and three times as high a tax rate as they do in the District of Columbia.

Now, I do not want the people of the District of Columbia to be penalized in any respect. I want to treat them just as fairly as the people in Massachusetts or Oregon, or anywhere else. There is an income tax in the District. But, it is the lowest income-tax rate that I know of in the whole country. If you know of any State that has an income tax at all, that has a lower rate, I would like to have you tell me about it. You have a sales tax, but you do not have a sales tax anywhere, where there is one at all, that is more favorable than the one in the District of Columbia. Not only that, but you have all of the preferences that are granted anywhere. You have only the one property tax. You do not have county taxes, city taxes, and State taxes, and school district taxes, and township taxes. You have just one property tax in the District of Columbia and that is all there is to it. And the tax rate here is lower than in any other city or community of comparative size. It is less than half of the total tax rate in the city of Wichita, Kans., or any other city in our district or our State. They tell you that they tax this property for full value. I made a little investigation with respect to that, and I found, in most cases, the tax valuation is quite moderate.

It has been suggested that contributions should be made percentage-wise. I am not so much interested in that proposal. I want the people of the District to pay a fair share of taxes comparative with those paid by other people in the United States. I certainly do not want them to pay more. Incidentally, you will find that taxes on personal property are extremely mild because of the exemption of \$1,000 allowed the taxpayer who is the head of a family before he pays any taxes. I can understand why a Representative of a State adjoining the District of Columbia may want to oppose this comparatively mild reduction. Someone mentioned the question of the liquor tax. I am not interested in liquor as such,

but I call your attention to the fact that in New York, for example, where they sell a considerable amount of liquor, the tax rate is twice the rate charged in the District of Columbia. I am advised that to increase the tax rate on liquor compared with that of New York it would result in approximately a million dollars more money. So the District of Columbia even has a preference on liquor taxes, where more liquor is consumed annually than in any other city in the United States of comparative size.

This is a mild reduction. I should add that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are charged with the responsibility of recommending the levying of sufficient taxes to run the government of the District of Columbia. If the rate of taxes on real and personal property were increased only 10 percent, it would more than offset the amount of this reduction. Even then the tax rate would be comparatively low. They could, as I have just suggested, increase liquor taxes and income taxes and still keep well under the average taxes paid by the residents in the cities in your States or elsewhere. All they need to do is raise the real-estate rate just a little bit and take care of this extra cost, or you could increase the liquor taxes a little or the income taxes, and still keep under the average and still pay less than you are paying in your city or I pay in mine.

This amendment is more than fair. The amount is comparatively small, but is more than a million dollars. Here is an opportunity to reduce the deficit to some degree and relieve the taxpayers of a burden that does not belong to them. The amendment should be approved.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to take vehement issue with the gentleman from Kansas that this is a mild and fair amendment. I think it is a very unfair amendment. Washington is a Federal city. It belongs to the Nation. We in this Congress who govern the allocation of the tax moneys, who govern the expenditures of this city, must determine how much should be the contribution of the Federal Government to the support of this Federal city, and we must be fair in our determination. We must make a fair contribution. The gentleman from Kansas would even eliminate the contribution entirely. I should like to ask all of those on the left side of the aisle who have talked about what a fair amendment this is, how many of them have signed the home-rule petition, which would entitle the people of this city to raise their own revenues and to pass upon their own costs of government. Very few, I am sure. Yet, giving the residents of this city no voice in the matter, you would, nevertheless, cut their funds.

Mr. REES. If the gentleman will yield, Does the gentleman think, then, that if we pass this home-rule amendment the Congress will not have to make any appropriations? Is that the point?

Mr. YATES. That is not my point at all. I am just trying to point out the unfairness of cutting the funds when you refuse to give the people of the city

of Washington a voice in their own government.

Mr. REES. If they would take care of it at no expense to the Government, that would be all right.

Mr. YATES. I should like to point out one other fact. This is only a portion of the total appropriation for the District of Columbia. The total appropriation for the District of Columbia will be approximately \$119,000,000, which will cover the entire cost for the government of the District of Columbia.

This section of the appropriations bill deals only with the contribution that shall be made by the Federal Government. Obviously it should make some contribution for the local services it receives. Who shall determine just exactly what the amount should be that the Federal Government should contribute? How should it be allocated? I think perhaps as good a formula as any is the amount of property owned by the Federal Government within the District of Columbia, a review of the amount of space it occupies, so that we may have a comparison, as an owner of property, with the other owners of property in the District of Columbia, whom you say are paying too low a tax.

I have here a statement showing the total acres occupied by Federal properties in the District of Columbia. The Federal Government occupies almost 31,000 acres of property in the District of Columbia, with a land value of over \$1,000,000,000. Based upon the present tax rate for the residents of the District of Columbia, a fair Federal share should be in the neighborhood of \$52,905,000.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. REES. I do not believe the gentleman meant 31,000,000 acres.

Mr. YATES. I am sorry. I accept the correction. It is 30,909.5763 acres.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman have the figures as to the present amount of taxable property in the District of Columbia?

Mr. YATES. Yes, I do. The total value of taxable property within the District of Columbia, based upon the assessments made against the home owners and against the commercial properties of the District is \$2,645,282,928. The tax predicated upon that assessment, and it is as uniform as it is to the other properties within the District of Columbia, should be in excess of \$52,000,000, or almost \$53,000,000.

Mr. REES. How about the value of personal property?

Mr. YATES. There is no computation in the statistics that I have with respect to personal property.

Mr. REES. How much personal property is taxed in the District? The gentleman does not know what the amount of personal property is in the District which is taxed?

Mr. YATES. I do not have that before me. The figures I have before me are a comparison between the real estate owned by the Federal Government and the amount it should pay based upon the existing assessment, formulas, and tax rates.

Mr. REES. What was the valuation of the real property in the District 10 years ago?

Mr. YATES. I do not have that before me. Ten years ago, obviously, it was lower because the cost of government has gone up.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I pay taxes in, I believe, four States. For 15 years I have been watching this situation here in the District of Columbia. Every chance I get on an amendment of this kind I am going to vote for the amendment in order to protect the taxpayers of my district. The people of the District of Columbia have so many blessings that they do not have to pay for in the way of beautiful streets and avenues and a clean city. Consider the approaches to the two bridges which are now being opened. Think of what I would call the decorations in the approaches to these bridges. Those things cost money. Somebody has to pay for them. The people in my district do not get the benefit of these things. The people who live in the District of Columbia get the benefits. The people here who are continually crying for home rule, if they ever get home rule, and if they ever have to pay the bills like the people in my State have to pay the bills for the improvements in our State, they are going to be pretty sick over home rule. I think this goes practically to the heart of the home rule issue which many of our people, through the States are being sold on, because they think that these are a group of poor little helpless people down here in the District who never have anybody to speak for them and never have anybody help them and who are taxed without representation and all that kind of philosophy which is being spread all over the country. I write to the people in my district and tell them very emphatically that if the people of the District of Columbia want home rule, they should assume all of the burdens and pay the bills of the District of Columbia just like the people out in my State have to pay the bills in our State. When they get the home rule issue down to a proposition like that, then maybe I will be a little more sympathetic to it than I am now. I am for this amendment. I hope the gentleman from New York will offer some similar amendments to other parts of the bill so I can vote for them, too, and cut these things down.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the tremendous number of people who will be coming to the District in the next 2 years because of the Sesquicentennial celebration, will add a considerable sum to the money which is collected as a result of the sales tax.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, they are coming here so fast now that the streets and hotels and different places cannot take care of them. They are pouring money in here all the time. Just like

going into a foreign country and putting dollar exchange in that country. I wish that in the States where I own property I could have a tax rate as reasonable as it is here in the District of Columbia. I would then be quite satisfied.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

In the first session of the Eightieth Congress the joint subcommittees on fiscal affairs of the Committee of the District of Columbia under the cochairmanship of the Senator from Washington, Mr. CAIN, and the late distinguished Congressman from Massachusetts, Mr. George Bates, held extensive hearings on the budget requirements of the District of Columbia. The outgrowth of these hearings was the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1943. This act, Public Law 195 of the Eightieth Congress, authorized among other things an appropriation of \$11,000,000 to go to the general fund of the District Government and \$1,000,000 to the water fund as the Federal Government's share of the cost of the operation of the Government of the Nation's Capital.

At the time of the enactment of this law the Federal contribution of \$11,000,000 comprised approximately 13½ percent of the cost of operation of the District Government. In the ensuing years this cost of operation has increased. A goodly portion of the cost has been the result of laws enacted by this Congress for the benefit of District workers and of Federal Government workers and agencies paid for from the funds of the District. This growth has become so pronounced that the budget, as submitted for the fiscal year 1951, totaled over \$103,000,000 in general-fund requests. The percentage of the United States share has dropped to 10.6 percent. If the Nation's Capital is to be maintained by the people and the Commissioners of the District Government in a manner befitting its position as the Capital City of the greatest Nation this world has ever seen, it does not seem fitting or appropriate that a further reduction should be made in the Federal contribution.

There has been a good deal of talk that the installation of the sales tax, as a result of the act of the first session of this Congress, has resulted in such an increase in revenue that the Federal contribution can be reduced. Such is not the case. Of course, the sales tax has resulted in revenue for the District of Columbia, but it has resulted in much-needed revenue, not that of a surplus nature.

Despite this increase of over \$12,000,000 in tax revenues, the construction programs and capital outlay needs, particularly in the realm of public schools and public welfare institutions, are still below the actual needs of the citizens of the

District. The capital outlay program is going forward now at a substantial pace. This will be brought home more clearly to Congress when the regular appropriation bill for the District is considered at a later date. However, if this capital outlay program is to be maintained at its present rate and if the citizens of the District are to be equipped with the schools and institutions to which they are entitled, then this Federal contribution cannot be cut.

There has been a good deal of talk as to the advisability of increasing the real estate tax in the District. On the face of it, perhaps the tax appears to be a bit low, yet the true measure of revenues derived from real estate lies in a comparison of the assessments and of the actual taxes collected on comparable property in several areas. In the last study made of 38 cities of over 250,000 population, Washington ranked second to New York in the value of the per capita assessment. Since that time the assessed evaluation in the District of Columbia has been increased by over 30 percent, which is one of the largest increases in this Nation, an increase made when other cities such as Pittsburgh and Buffalo were showing actual decreases in per capita assessment.

A comparative study has been made of the revenues collected from comparable property in nearby Maryland and Virginia. Dollar for dollar, it has been found that the tax on comparable property in the District runs a little higher than that in Maryland and Virginia. I firmly believe that an additional increase in the real property tax in the District of Columbia would result in such a decentralization of business here that it would result in not an increase in revenue collections but rather an astounding decrease.

In connection with the Federal contribution, let us look for a moment at some of the things for which this money is spent. The National Zoological Park is under the sole control and supervision of the Smithsonian Institution. The District Commissioners have nothing whatsoever to say in regard to its operation, personnel selection, or anything about it and yet in the fiscal year 1949 the sum of \$550,900 was appropriated for this work. In like manner, over \$2,000,000 was appropriated from District funds to the National Capital Parks, an agency of the Department of the Interior, over which the District Commissioners exercise no control, even of an advisory nature. The same is true for an appropriation of almost \$90,000 for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Why, the District Government is even called upon to support the National Guard to the tune of over \$100,000 per year, and the District of Columbia National Guard is a strictly Federal organization under the exclusive control of the President of the United States. In addition to this the District is called upon to appropriate \$200,000 annually for the maintenance and operation of the National Guard Armory, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have absolutely no control over either the armory or the National Guard. Why, if we were to have an emergency here in

Washington, the commissioners, believe me, would not have the power to call out the National Guard to enforce order. You know and I know that this is contrary to the situation prevailing in every State, and yet there are those here today who would cut the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia.

Why, I could go on and on and cite examples in the District government of their large contributions to Federal agencies. For example, the nearly \$8,000,000 appropriated annually to the operation of St. Elizabeths, the Federal Security Agency's hospital here in the District. I could tell of the school operated in the Wilson Teacher's College building, a District institution maintained by District personnel for the use of the Department of State for the instruction of foreigners in this country for State Department purposes, and, mind you, the Federal Government has not contributed one red cent for the operation of this school.

Mr. Chairman, I could stand here for hours and talk on the relationship and the responsibilities of the Federal Government to the District of Columbia and vice versa. However, I shall not belabor the point or take up the valuable time of this legislative body with further discourse.

Washington is more than a city, more than a district, and, yes, perhaps more than a State, for it is a shrine in the hearts and minds of American people. It is the heart of the Government, of a nation, and of a people, dedicated to liberty, freedom, and peace. Every week finds hundreds and thousands of people from every section of America coming to Washington to see the seat of government, with its many institutions, museums, and buildings dedicated to telling the story of our country. These people come, not to see the glitter and bright lights such as we find in the other large cities of our Nation—New York and Chicago—but they come to see and to pay tribute to a city dedicated to serve as the capital of a nation, a city whose very foundation rests upon the principles which have made this Nation great, a city dedicated to serving this Nation of ours and its people. If this shrine of freedom is to be maintained as a fitting memorial to the thousands of men and women who have died that this Nation might have life, then I think that the cost of a mere \$12,000,000 is a small, even paltry, sum to pay as the Federal Government's share of the operation of such a city.

The gentleman's amendment to reduce this share is not only a poor amendment—it is even an absurd one and should be voted down vigorously and by an overwhelming majority by the Members of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 61, noes 47.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BATES of Kentucky and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 86, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Page 2, line 5, after the period, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be used for any of the purposes therein mentioned by any agency, office or department of the District of Columbia which segregates the citizens of the District of Columbia in employment, facilities afforded, services performed, accommodations furnished, instructions or aid granted, on account of race, color, creed, or place of national origin of the citizens of the District of Columbia."

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman. I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. It goes beyond the scope of the chapter that we have under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. Mr. Chairman. The amendment is a negative limitation. It does not violate the Holman rule. It provides for a saving. We had the same situation on March 2, 1949, and on April 5, 1946, and the germaneness of the amendment was sustained by the Chairmen. I call the Chair's attention to the two precedents, the one on March 2, 1949, and the one on April 5, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I just rise to say that this amendment is not in order. In the first place it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It attempts to change a law, to change the requirements, you might say, for the use of this money in the District of Columbia, and in that way attempts to write legislation into an appropriation bill, and is therefore not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment which has been reported. Of course, the decision of the Chair has to be in conformance with the precedents and the rules of the House, and it certainly does not reflect any individual views of the Chair.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the identical amendment was offered on two previous occasions, on April 15, 1946, and on March 2, 1949. In both instances the point of order was overruled. Under the precedents here

cited, the Chair is compelled to overrule the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was offered in the Seventy-ninth Congress, it was offered in the Eightieth Congress, and it is offered in this Congress.

This year it is offered against the background of a Congress composed of the two major political parties, both of which went before the country and professed love for civil rights and promised action on civil rights.

It is my best guess that this Congress will adjourn sometime around the middle of July, so we are really on our last legislative leg as far as the life of this Congress is concerned.

The record of this Congress is what on civil rights? We have done nothing. We have received double talk and we have also received the double cross on the issue of civil rights all the way down the line, from the White House to Capitol Hill. Action has been promised time and time again and action has been postponed time and time again. Whenever there has been an opportunity for action on civil rights, that opportunity has been destroyed either by surreptitious sabotage on the part of the President and his Democratic Party leadership on a Monday or sabotage open and avowed on the part of the Republican Party on a Wednesday. There has never been a more inglorious page written in the history of this country than the one on civil rights. It is a page of hypocrisy and double dealing by both the Republicans and the Democrats.

With this amendment we again have an opportunity to live up to the commitments we made in the last election. This year we again go before the electorate of this country. I suppose the Democrats will be blaming the Republicans and the Republicans will be blaming the Democrats, but the record speaks for itself. A Republican Congress, the Eightieth Congress, did nothing for civil rights. A Democratic Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, betrayed the promises and the campaign pledges the President and his party made on this issue.

What are we asking here by this amendment? We are simply asking that in the Capital of the Nation the practice of segregation cease on the part of the Government agencies connected with the operation of the government of the District of Columbia. Is that asking too much from a Congress, the majority of which was elected on a platform of civil rights?

Let me ask some of you gentlemen, by what right, legal, moral, or ethical, can you take the funds of a Negro taxpayer and use those very same dollars together with the dollars of a white taxpayer to perpetuate discrimination and segregation in the District of Columbia against the Negro? Just by what right do you do it? You assert that practice by violence, by the violence of white supremacy.

That is the only way you can assert that practice and carry it on. I repeat that. You assert it by the violence of

white supremacy. You violate every precept of decency and you subvert every principle of democracy. You violate every profession of democracy found in every great document of this Nation of ours. You violate every ethical and moral principle and you assert your white supremacy by violence so that you can keep alive this vile system of economic exploitation of 14,000,000 Negroes. Here Congress year in and year out has been placing its stamp of approval on this violence and oppression. What is worse, it has refused to lift a finger to put a stop to this abhorrent practice.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable, very regrettable indeed that the floor has so many present who are opposed to this kind of amendment. Where are the October friends of civil rights today? This amendment and the offering of it was no secret. It has been a yearly practice. Everybody knows that this amendment is offered to the District of Columbia appropriation bill. What is more, it was published in this morning's paper that it was going to be offered. Why the absence of these election-time friends of civil rights from the floor of the House? Where are they? Why are they not here? Is it because we are voting in the Committee of the Whole where there is no record vote on this matter? Is it because you can dodge behind this parliamentary device so that you can conceal your absenteeism and conceal your sabotage of this effort in the fight to establish equality in the District of Columbia? I do not think you are going to fool anybody. Let me tell you, you are not going to fool 14,000,000 Negro people in this country with this kind of conduct any more. You are not going to fool the other people—the white people who believe in the principle of equality and who want the Congress to act on it. You are not going to fool anybody, may I say to the leadership of the House by saying, "Well, the Dixie Democrats beat us." Well, the Dixie Democrats are not in the majority. They constitute a minority. Where are the Democrats from the big cities? Where are the Republicans who have been professing love for civil rights? Where are the leaderships of both parties? Why do they not support this amendment which is an integral part of their party platforms?

The Dixie Democrats are here, but they do not constitute a majority. Where is the majority which was elected by the American people on the basis of a promise to enact civil rights?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, you have just listened to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] arguing in favor of his so-called civil-rights amendment.

It is really an amendment to persecute white Americans in the District of Columbia, using the Negro as a smoke screen to carry out a Communist program. If you will get hold of a magazine

which the Communist Party issued a few years ago, called the Negro in Soviet-America, you will find that this amendment would simply carry out the Communist Party lines.

It should be called an amendment to stir up race riots in the District of Columbia. That is what it would mean. I never dreamed that I would live to see the white Americans in the District of Columbia persecuted as they are being persecuted today—even without the Marcantonio amendment. They are being driven from their homes by this so-called antisegregation movement, promulgated by a racial minority, whose real-estate agents are taking Negroes into the white residential sections, with the result that white Americans are moving across the river into Virginia or out into Maryland by the thousands.

White Americans in the District of Columbia are being driven from their apartments in the same way, and are being forced to seek refuge in Virginia or Maryland.

These white Americans are being driven from the restaurants and hotels in the District of Columbia in the same way. They are being driven from the Federal pay roll, to escape the humiliation that is being imposed upon them under the present regime.

These racial minorities that are always whining about civil rights have a hundred times as many of their own members on the Federal pay roll as they are numerically entitled to. The result is that the service has degenerated in every branch of the Government, from the Library of Congress to the Bureau of the Census. Never have I seen such a lack of efficiency in these departments as we are witnessing today, as a result of this communistic pressure that has literally forced white Americans out of their jobs.

But the craziest step that I have ever known to be taken in a civilized country was the Executive order wiping out segregation in our armed forces. That was the greatest victory Stalin has won since Yalta. It did more to cripple our national defense than anything else that has ever been done in all the history of this Government.

How much longer, I ask you Members of the House, are you going to tolerate these communistic movements that threaten the very life of the Nation?

This amendment may sound harmless to some of you; but if it is adopted, and written into the law, in my opinion, it will intensify the racial feeling now existing in the District of Columbia, and probably result in race riots and mob violence, the like of which this Capital has never seen.

You have just witnessed the most nauseating spectacle in all the history of this Capital, when a little woman, named Ruth Weyand, a member of a racial minority—and Communist if there ever was one—passing as a white woman, wormed her way into the position of attorney for the Labor Relations Board, and went before the Supreme Court of the United States, filed a brief, and probably made an argument, urging

that Court to take it upon itself to legislate through a judicial fiat and outlaw segregation throughout the United States. It developed that this woman, of foreign extraction, had been living with a Negro man. The Negro's wife sued her for alienating her husband's affection. She came back and claimed that she was married to this Negro. The case became so nauseating that she was removed from her job as attorney for the Labor Relations Board. She now claims that this was discrimination because of race, creed, or color.

It is time that the white Americans in this country—who have built this Nation and made it great, who have fought its battles in times of war, and who have sustained its institutions in times of peace—it is time they are given the consideration to which they are entitled, and that these persecutions of them cease.

I hope that Mr. MARCANTONIO's amendment will be voted down by such an overwhelming majority that it will never again see the light of day.

Let us put a stop to these communistic movements, and save America for Americans.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Before expressing my reasons for opposing this Communist amendment, I wish to call the attention of the membership to the definition of "Democratic Party" as given in an edition of Funk and Wagnall's dictionary. I am somewhat embarrassed for never having looked in the dictionary for a definition of "Democratic Party," and the matter was called to my attention by an editorial appearing in a weekly newspaper, the Easley (S. C.) Progress, in my district, which was published on April 13, 1950. According to the dictionary, "Democratic Party" is defined as "this party has always advocated a rigid adherence to the principles of the Constitution and the equality and autonomy of the States, while opposing the centralization of power in the Federal Government." Those few lines completely express the Democratic Party I believe in.

With that preface it is almost needless for me to enumerate specific reasons for opposing the proposed amendment, because, in my opinion, any public official who favors the enactment of the civil-rights program, including FEPC, or amendments designed for the same purpose, violates his oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution.

It is absolutely a shame and disgrace and an insult to the intelligent thinking American to realize that such proposals are presented to this body for consideration. I shall consider my life as a success if I can contribute in any manner toward the defeat of such un-American proposals.

The average citizen of these United States, regardless of his race, creed, or color, holds no brief or favoritism for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Apparently the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] would have us follow a philosophy that segregation of the races is a discrimination only against the Negro. However, the abolition of segregation would actually be a discrimination against the white race, the yellow race, and the Negro race as well.

The gentleman from New York, whether he realizes it or not, is advocating communism by offering the proposed amendment. That is true because he seeks to compel an employer to hire individuals against his will and desire. In other words, he seeks to make a dictator of the Federal Government. In my opinion, in so doing he is seeking the overthrow of this Government, and it is high time that the membership and his constituents, as well as the people of the United States realize it. I do not intend to cast reflection upon his personal integrity, but wish to emphasize to the membership and the people the danger in his philosophy.

I have the privilege and honor of representing a district in which there are many Negro citizens. I know their nature and I know their attitude as all southerners do. There is no race in the United States which abhors or detests the abolition of segregation as does the colored race, and it is high time that the proponents of proposals as made by the gentleman from New York come to realize it.

One cannot compel another to work for him, because that would be involuntary servitude—slavery, and our Constitution specifically prohibits same. Yet, on the other hand, the enactment of the proposed amendment would subject the employer to involuntary servitude if he refused to hire an individual because of race, creed, color, or national origin. In other words, the gentleman from New York desires to make individual business and the Government slaves to a dictatorial Government. If that is not communism, I do not know what is.

I sincerely hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] while disassociating myself from many of the observations he has advanced.

He knows as well as I, and as well as the other Members of this House, why we have not approved a full civil-rights program in this session. He knows as well as I that the President and his supporters in Congress have done everything in their power to secure such legislation, and have been defeated by the backsliding of Republicans who did not respect their party platform. He undoubtedly knows as well as I that such speeches as he has just delivered do the

supporters of civil rights in this House an injustice and the cause of civil rights considerable damage. In the light of such knowledge, the gentleman from New York is privileged to reexamine his statements. The other Members of the House understand them well.

The gentleman's purposes aside, the amendment should stand on its own merits. This is our National Capital. We have erected here monuments to the great men and great ideas which have guided us throughout our history. We have built a spacious and beautiful city to symbolize the ideals that have made us a nation.

Yet the practices of segregation and discrimination continue in the shadow of the monuments to the men who wrote that all men are created equal, in the Capital of a nation dedicated to equality of opportunity and the dignity of man.

We are engaged in a world struggle with Soviet Russia, a struggle that is as much in men's minds and hearts as it is in the maneuverings of the cold war. We are appealing to men of all nationalities, creeds, and colors throughout the world to recognize that only democracy such as ours can make all men free and equal before the law. These men of all nationalities, creeds and colors throughout the world look toward the source of that lofty appeal, to Washington. What they see makes a mockery of the words they hear.

I think we should adopt this amendment and end this double standard of political morality. The city of Washington is not so much a geographic entity as it is the political meeting place of all Americans, and America's place of business, both domestic and foreign. The mores and customs of this city should be the mores and customs of the whole people of this Nation, the mores and customs that we rightfully claim as American throughout the world.

We are all religious men here. I personally believe deeply in the Christian tradition, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. In Christian terms, discrimination and segregation are immoral, inexcusable lapses from grace and faith.

I ask Members of this House to put aside those prejudices and ideas which threaten our unity in a time of crisis for the Nation and the world. Let us approve this amendment and make Washington an American city in the fullest meaning of those words.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have been frequently asked about the proceeding on the bill, as to whether the Committee will rise and report to the House at the conclusion of each chapter or wait until the entire bill has been completed before the Committee rises and reports the entire bill to the House with whatever amendments may be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from New York, the Chair will state that action will be completed on the entire bill which will then be reported to the

House, unless the House orders a different procedure.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 21, noes 67.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

CHAPTER II. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, \$5,492,500.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of chapter II be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman include in his request that amendments and points of order may be reserved to any part of the chapter?

Mr. McGRATH. I make that as a part of my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be raised to chapter II? [After a pause.] If not, they are waived.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 25, line 6, strike out "\$8,500,000" and insert "\$8,000,000".

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I have offered refers to the item of congressional printing and binding, which is the only actual appropriation item over which the legislative committee has any control as far as the Government Printing Office is concerned.

The testimony showed that their estimate was based on a figure of \$8,750,000 for the coming fiscal year 1951 for printing and binding, which of course takes in the matter of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Legislative Digest, all bills, reports, hearings, and all of the business before the Congress.

You will also find from reading the hearings that last year the item was \$8,000,000, and the Government Printer estimated that the \$8,000,000 would be sufficient to cover all congressional printing for this fiscal year of 1950.

It should be recalled that last fall—and this was one of the reasons for a great deal of the Government printing—we returned into session in the fall and remained in session until almost the 1st of November. All of us realize, of course, that this is election year, and the elections will be about the 1st of November, so I think we can safely anticipate that we will not come back into session this fall after we once adjourn. Therefore, it should be reasonably assumed that

there will be less printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and there will be fewer reports and there will be very few new bills introduced. Then, of course, we will come back into session the first of January, and the only printing we will have to pay for will be from the first of January until the end of the fiscal year, July 1. I would be less than frank with the House, however, if I did not say that should there be any greater demand for spending for congressional printing than we assume is likely to occur, the Government Printer would be perfectly justified in coming in late next spring and submitting to us a deficiency request, which of course would be proper. In this situation, however, our guess is surely as good as the Government Printer's.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman from Kansas recognizes the fact that in the report we stated that this was purely an approximation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is true.

Mr. McGRATH. And the half-million-dollar increase was partially in recognition of the wage raises that were granted in the departments. I agree with the gentleman, however, that we should be as economically minded as we can, and the committee very gladly accepts the amendment; we have no objection to it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from New York for that statement. At this time I think it is perfectly proper that I should point out to the Members of the House that in this Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee there has been the greatest degree of cooperation, friendship, and cordiality. The statement just made by the gentleman from New York demonstrates one of the reasons why it was possible for us to work together in such a fine spirit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Page 3, line 6, strike out "\$5,492,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,135,000."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that there is no authority in law for this increase.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MULTER. No; I do not care to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] cite any authorization of law for the increase proposed by his amendment?

Mr. MULTER. Only the fact that this body has the authority to fix the salary of its Members. I think it does not matter how or in what bill the House does it. It may do so as part of an appropriation bill. This item being the

item appropriating for the pay of Members of Congress I think it is subject to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, while I recognize that the Members of the House are deserving of an increase in compensation, yet my position at this time is of a legislative capacity and I must support the rules of the House.

I respectfully submit that the point of order lies against the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, this is an amendment to the gross amount for salaries. It is not in order, of course, because the only authority we have is to appropriate an amount equivalent to the product of the fixed salary times the number of Members. The effect of the amendment would not even be to increase the salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has offered an amendment which has been reported; the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amount sought to be included by the amendment is not authorized by law.

The Chair has examined the question to some extent, and it appears that the amount carried in the bill reflects the amount authorized by existing law. Therefore, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would be in excess of existing authority of law. The point of order is sustained.

LABOR IS WORTHY OF ITS HIRE; IS NOT A CONGRESSMAN?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to provide increased funds with which to pay salaries to the Members of the House of Representatives at the rate of \$20,000 per annum for the second half of the fiscal year provided for by this appropriation bill, beginning with the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. There is no intent by the amendment to increase the salaries of the Members during the current session. We were elected on the basis of fixed salaries of \$12,500 per annum. It is my opinion that even if there were not legal obstacles to increasing our own salaries during our own terms of office, it would be a breach of contract to say the least for us to change that. We do have the right to increase the salaries of those who may be elected to serve in successive Congresses, and that we should do.

In offering the amendment I appreciate the parliamentary difficulties which may make it impossible for the House to consider this matter at this time.

Even if the amendment were considered and carried, it still could not be effective until the basic legislation authorizing the payment of the salaries was similarly amended so as to provide for the increase. I offer the amendment at this time, nevertheless, in order to direct attention to the fact that there is pending a bill for increased salaries, and although the chairman of the committee has promised this House action on it, he unfortunately has not yet called any hearings.

The overwhelming sentiment of this House and of the country is in favor of such increased salaries. Our President, Harry S. Truman, the Hoover Commission, and any number of independent sources have recommended that salaries of Members of Congress be increased to as much as \$25,000 per year. My amendment and my bill call for an increase to only \$20,000 per year.

I know that many of the Members feel that this being an election year, legislation of this kind should not be brought before the House at this time. I vigorously disagree with them on that score. I doubt whether a single Member of this House who will stand for reelection in the fall will lose a single vote by his support of this legislation. I dare say Members who voice opposition to the increase of their salaries may, on the other hand, find themselves confronted with the potent argument that their constituents do not want any man serving them in Congress who thinks he is worth less than \$20,000 per year.

Service in Congress today is a full-time job, requiring diligent attention to the duties of the office day and night, 7 days a week, 52 weeks in the year.

Labor is worthy of its hire; is not a Congressman?

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 24, line 18, strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$15,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 29, after line 13, insert a new section reading, as follows:

"The total sums appropriated under this chapter shall be reduced to the extent of any separate and distinct item appropriating money which is disapproved by the President."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the wording of this amendment is designed to be, and I believe is, a limitation on the appropriation. As I stated in general debate on the subject, I have introduced a bill which would have the effect of giving the President the power to veto any

single item in an appropriation bill which he does not now have. He is forced, therefore, to approve or disapprove the whole bill.

I appreciate that to endeavor to provide for that in this measure would be legislation on an appropriation bill. This, however, is not worded in that way. It provides that the sums appropriated here shall be reduced by the amount of any distinct item which the President feels should be disapproved; in other words, he will have the power under this amendment to join with us, if he is so disposed, in the battle for economy. I believe the amendment as worded, being a limitation, is in order.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, may I call the Chair's attention to the fact that this is a delegation of power from the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government and is clearly legislative in character.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has analyzed the amendment and it appears clearly that the purpose of it is to confer item veto power on the President, which would be legislation on an appropriation bill in that it confers authority and power on the President which he does not have. Under the rules of the House, being legislation on an appropriation bill, it is subject to the point of order, and, therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The President under the budget law has the power to impound funds appropriated for any branch of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that fact and that the President has exercised that power at times in impounding funds.

I have two rejoinders to that. First, the President has failed to exercise the power in a number of instances where it might well have been exercised. In some cases he might have acted differently with advantage to the taxpayers if he had had before him a precise measure for approval or disapproval. In other words, he would be more likely to cut out appropriations lacking substantial merit if confronted with the duty of passing on each item separately, than he would to impound funds for specific purposes.

The second point is, it seems to me, that the orderly procedure for us to follow legislatively is to provide for such single item veto rather than to leave this power to the President which he now has and which he has exercised perhaps at times contrary to the will of the Congress.

It seems to me that the adoption of a measure such as this would go a long

way toward enabling the President, if that is his disposition, to join with us in our endeavor to cut the budget.

When this appropriation bill reaches the President's desk, he will be compelled to sign it or disapprove it in its entirety. If there are items in it where he feels we have acted unwisely, there is nothing he can do about it. He should be given the authority to veto any single item in the appropriation bill which he feels is improper. The conferral of this power, if diligently and conscientiously exercised by the President, would be one of the most effective steps we could take to approach our goal of a balanced budget.

In our deliberations on this bill, it is imperative that we leave no stone unturned in our search for legitimate ways and means of effecting economies without impairment of essential services. The people back home expect this of us. They have a right to expect it.

I regret that the amendment has been ruled out on a point of order. I appreciate that the Chairman has rendered his ruling in a sincere effort to follow legislative precedents. Nothing further can be done at this point. I hope that the committee to which my bill has been referred, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, will give early consideration to the suggestion I have made.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the power that the President now has to impound funds is sufficient? In 1947, the day the Congress adjourned, I remember the President impounded about 50 percent of the funds Congress had appropriated for flood control and for irrigation and reclamation. He has pretty broad powers now, and I am wondering if the amendment that the gentleman has just offered, and which was ruled out of order, would not give the President possibly more power than he should have.

Mr. KEATING. My feeling is that it would approach this problem in an orderly way, and that if the President is going to rule out an item or items, the proper way to do it is by approving or disapproving specific items in the appropriation bill rather than by the exercise of his inherent impounding powers. That does not seem to me the proper way to approach the problem.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would not want the gentleman from Iowa to leave the impression that the President has the right or authority under the Constitution to tie up funds appropriated by the Congress. It is true that he did impound irrigation and reclamation funds, but he violated the Constitution of the United States when he did that.

Mr. KEATING. Well, there are many of us who disagree with many of the actions of the President, I feel sure. Although I am not familiar with the legal

implications of this particular action on his part, there are other steps he has taken of which I have been critical.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, possibly I should have said that the President took the power to do that thing. I rather agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] that under the Constitution he does not have that privilege. But, of course, in his new way of doing things, why the President sometimes takes some authority that some of us cannot quite understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 25, line 12, strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have not so far offered any amendments to this chapter. I do not believe I shall offer any.

Together with the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Kansas and accepted, the total cost of this particular chapter, the legislative housekeeping job, is reduced \$9,000,000. That is about 14 percent of the \$65,000,000 which was recommended in the budget. The subcommittee has made substantial cuts, so that with the cuts made by the Committee of the Whole on the President's budget it looks as though we had arrived at a reasonable figure. It will not be my purpose to offer amendments for additional cuts, where proper cuts have been made, but where I feel the proper cuts have not been made I shall be obliged to offer amendments for further cuts.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman's statement is particularly true in a situation such as we find here, where many of these items are purely mathematical. For instance, one of the larger items is the salaries and expenses of Members of Congress, Commissioners, and Delegates. There is just nothing that can be done on an item like that.

Mr. TABER. Where the salaries are fixed and the employment is fixed, that is true.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. When we allow funds in a lump sum, as in the item suggested by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and allow a certain amount to a department or agency, as a general rule it is expended by the end of the year. If you allow such an item to stay in the bill, it is more likely to be spent than not. Most of the time they have a way of spending the money if you once allocate the funds.

Mr. TABER. The departments have a bad habit of calling whatever is left in the middle of May "hot money." The

word will get out somehow or other for them to get busy and find some way of obligating that money before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. REES. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. TABER. That is a very, very bad practice all the way through the Government of the United States. You see men occasionally on a train, and without their knowing who you are, they will get to visiting with you and will tell you that because of the "hot money" they had to spend they were obliged to take a particular trip.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a brief moment to point out on page 13 of the hearings an item of increase with which I think all the Members of the House will be in accord. I am quite sure if they knew him as the Members of the House knew him, all the taxpayers of America would be in accord with it. It is the item of increase in the office of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives made necessary by the fact that our dearly beloved Rev. James Shera Montgomery was retired as Chaplain Emeritus, and, of course, under this action his pay carries on as a tribute to his long and faithful years of very fine service and spiritual guidance for the House of Representatives.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. I join the gentleman from Kansas on behalf of the Democratic Members in expressing the same sentiments.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

CHAPTER III. DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

The CHAIRMAN. Under agreement entered into in the House, there being no further amendments to chapter II, general debate is now in order on chapter III of the bill for not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the next chapter of the so-called package appropriation bill covers the appropriations for the coming fiscal year for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Federal Judiciary.

At the outset, as chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to express my appreciation to my four distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], for their untiring work and splendid cooperation.

I could not pick four Members of this House with whom I would rather sit day after day and week after week listening to testimony in support of budget estimates than with these four gentlemen who are my close personal friends

and for whom I have the highest regard and esteem.

The total requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, and for the Federal Judiciary, was \$1,184,035,897 in cash and \$91,036,500 in contract authority. Taking the four subdivisions of this part, or this chapter of the package appropriation bill, the amount allowed by your committee for the four agencies is \$1,110,870,462, in cash, as well as \$65,786,500 in contract authority, making a total of \$1,176,656,962 in both appropriations and contract authorizations.

The reductions recommended by the committee amount to \$73,165,435 in direct appropriations and \$25,250,000 in contract authority, making a total reduction in this chapter of the package bill of \$98,415,435.

The total direct appropriation recommended for the coming fiscal year is \$19,997,177 less than the amount appropriated for these four items in the current fiscal year.

The total contract authorization recommended is \$2,413,500 less than the amount given as contract authority in the present fiscal year. The net amount recommended by your committee for fiscal year 1951 in direct appropriations and contract authorization is \$22,410,677 less than the amount appropriated and authorized for the current fiscal year.

Included in this chapter is a new item for the Bureau of Roads which had heretofore been carried in the Independent Offices appropriation bill. The budget estimates for this Bureau alone amounted to \$455,900,000, an increase of \$48,400,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The first of the subdivisions of this chapter to which I shall refer is that which provides funds for the fiscal year 1951 for the Department of State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the \$455,000,000 for the Bureau of Roads have anything to do with road construction, or is it purely for administration?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no. That is money for the Federal-aid highway program in cooperation with the State highway departments, and the forest highway program. The bulk of it is for construction and is turned over to the States as grants. It is really part of the money that comes to the Treasury as the result of the Federal gasoline tax, and taxes on oil, tires, new automobiles, and so forth.

Mr. DONDERO. Well, what is the purpose of the use of this money? Does it go into the general funds of the Government or is it purely for administration?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no, not at all. It includes an amount for administration, but the bulk of it is for the construction of highways. Only about \$12,000,000 of the half billion is for personal services.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason for the question is this: That the committee of which I happen to be a member, the Committee on Public Roads, is getting ready to report a bill to the House for a

large sum of money, in fact, nearly a billion and a half dollars, for that very purpose. That is the reason I am asking whether this amount is to supplement that in any way.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, if the gentleman's legislative committee reports out a bill with authority for expenditure of a billion and a half dollars in it, there is not too much that the Committee on Appropriations can do. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, sitting day after day, listen to the testimony with the realization in our minds that there is nothing much that we can do about it, because the legislative committee reports out a bill spending the money before it is appropriated.

Mr. DONDERO. I think perhaps what the gentleman is saying is that that money is really being appropriated under a bill passed by a previous Congress, for the construction of roads or for the matching of funds with the States.

Mr. ROONEY. Exactly so. There is a very unusual situation with reference to this particular item for the Bureau of Roads. There is not very much that the Appropriations Committee can do, except to write a blank check, because the money is already spent before they come to us for the appropriation.

Now with regard to the Department of State, the total amount recommended in this chapter for that Department is \$217,651,297, which is a decrease of \$12,426,100 in the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, and a decrease of \$82,754,099 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The largest reduction is in the item, "Contributions to international organizations," and it amounts to \$42,766,611, which is due to a decrease of over \$45,000,000 in the amount requested for the International Refugee Organization. The committee has seen fit to reduce the amount requested for the buildings fund of the Department of State, to the extent of \$5,000,000, and in the appropriation for international information and educational activities to the extent of \$13,300,000.

Included in the State Department part of the chapter is an important item entitled "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico." The committee has recommended an appropriation, and the bill now before you contains language which would expend the sum of \$6,065,000 for this activity in the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of \$4,030,000 over the current year appropriations and a decrease of \$2,550,000 in the budget estimate.

The amount of \$1,000,000 is allowed for the item, "Salaries and expenses" and \$30,000 for the item, "Rio Grande emergency flood protection."

The amount of \$5,035,000 is recommended for construction. One of the principal projects which comes within the jurisdiction of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is the construction of the highly important Falcon Dam. The plans and specifications for this dam have not as yet been completed; and a

reduction of \$1,750,000 is made for this construction item. This will provide a total of \$2,750,000 toward the cost of construction of the dam, to which must be added an estimated minimum of \$4,500,000 balance which will be available from prior year appropriations. There is not any question, I say to the gentleman from Texas, about this reduction interfering in the slightest with the progress of the construction of Falcon Dam, because the amount allowed, \$2,750,000 in cash when added to the unexpended balance of \$4,500,000 amounts to \$7,250,000, is ample to continue the progress toward completion of the plans and specifications and the start of construction of the dam and the letting of the contracts incidental thereto.

I will now refer to the Department of Justice part of the bill wherein the amount recommended is \$144,230,000, a decrease of \$3,195,800 in the budget estimates but an increase of \$11,184,859 over the appropriations for the present fiscal year.

I trust that when you are called upon to vote on any across-the-board cuts that the membership may be called upon to consider you ask yourselves how such meat-ax cuts can be applied to an agency such as the Department of Justice, because included in this appropriation of \$144,230,000 are funds for legal activities and general administration of the Attorney General's office, including the Criminal Division, the Tax Division, the Customs Division, the Lands Division, the Claims Division, the Antitrust Division, and the rest of the personnel which make up the Office of the Attorney General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation under J. Edgar Hoover, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal prison system, and the Office of Alien Property. In connection with the FBI which I mention may I say that the committee allowed the full amount of the budget estimate for this highly important arm of Government and has no intention of interfering in any respect with the activities of the FBI. Under the terms of this bill, as a matter of fact, there will be seven hundred and some more positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation beginning with the new fiscal year on July 1, than there are at the present time. These include 325 more agents.

The third principal item in the bill is the Department of Commerce, wherein there is a total appropriation recommended of \$725,429,000. This is an increase of \$49,875,098 over appropriations for the current year and a reduction of \$56,990,000 in the budget estimates.

The large increase over the amount allowed by the Congress for the current fiscal year relates to the substantial increases of appropriations for the Bureau of Public Roads and for the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The increase for the Civil Aeronautics Administration amounts to \$46,389,098 and for the Bureau of Public Roads it is \$24,600,000. These increases are due principally to the necessity of providing funds for the liquidation of contract authorizations previously granted by the Congress. I am not too familiar with the other bills that make up this pack-

age appropriation bill but I am fairly familiar with this one, as are the members of my committee. We were really appalled when we learned of all the contract authorizations that are catching up with us and for which we must provide cash appropriations. You cannot fool the public. You cannot take an item of \$40,000,000 requested for an agency, give them a million dollars in cash and \$39,000,000 in a contract authorization without having to pay out that \$39,000,000 in cash at some time. It is bound to catch up with you, and that is the situation with regard to a great deal of this money in the Department of Commerce part of the bill.

I shall conclude my brief general summary of the items in the bill by referring to the last part thereof which provides for the Federal judiciary, wherein the amount recommended, \$23,560,156, is an increase of \$1,764,465 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year and a reduction of \$553,535 in the budget estimates.

It occurs to me that I might point out another matter which catches up with the Committee on Appropriations. That is the matter of mandatory pay increases. I voted for them as did most of the Members here. But let us not talk economy on the one hand and on the other hand vote these pay increases if you do not expect to pay for them because all these pay increases have had to be provided for in this year's bill. I do not recall when we first started debate on this package appropriation bill—it was weeks ago—but I believe the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] mentioned the total amount involved in this package appropriation bill for pay raises granted by this very Congress. My point is: you should not vote for pay raises and not expect to have to pay them.

If there are any questions with regard to any of the items in the bill I shall be glad to answer them to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I notice in this report quite a number of international agencies, many more than we have had in recent years.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think it is an accurate statement to say "many more than we have had in recent years."

Mr. REES. Maybe not in the last year, but in the last comparatively few years. In any event, there are quite a number of them.

Mr. ROONEY. They are listed on pages 35 and 36 of the report.

Mr. REES. That is correct. What consideration has been given with respect to combining these agencies or discontinuing them? What has the committee done?

Mr. ROONEY. The committee has given no consideration to combining them because it has no power or authority to do so.

Mr. REES. Or recommending anything of that kind.

Mr. ROONEY. It has no compelling authority to do so. As far as cutting down the amount of the share of the United States in these international organizations is concerned, the committee time and time again and once again this year in its report has pointed out that the share being paid by the United States for its participation in them is far too much. We are in the position where we can merely raise some Cain about it. We do raise some Cain, and if you read the hearings I say to the gentleman from Kansas, you will find that every member of this subcommittee, your colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] joined the gentleman from New York in denouncing some of these international organizations and people in our Department of State for the amount of the share that we have been called upon to pay.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. May I direct attention to page 35 of the report on the general bill, the first paragraph on that page, which reads as follows:

The committee again stresses its concern over the large number of organizations to which we are required to contribute. Every effort must be made to reduce the unusually high percentage of contributions which in all too many instances this country is called upon to make. The high percentage of contribution of the United States should be reduced just as quickly as the economic conditions of other member countries make possible their assuming a more equitable share of the cost. The committee will examine carefully the Department's submission of this item next year to determine what accomplishments have been made by the Department in obtaining such reductions.

I might say to the gentleman that the Department itself has concurred with this subcommittee in expressing its concern over the number of these international agencies, and I believe it is the concern and the attitude of the State Department to agree with the chairman and with the attitude I believe, indicated by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that reply satisfactory, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. REES. The statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the thing that attracted my attention.

No. 2, with respect to this contract authority, I want to commend the gentleman for his explanation, for his calling our attention to the fact that when Congress once authorizes a project, such as flood control or whatever it is, then it is obligating the Government for the completion of that project. I also want to commend the gentleman for the very fine explanation he has made with respect to this proposed legislation.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank my distinguished friend from Kansas.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and

the Federal Judiciary for the fiscal year 1951, I first want to pay a tribute and commend the efficient work of all members of the subcommittee and also our executive secretary. This committee has labored for several months on what, in my opinion, is a most complex appropriation bill dealing with some of the most important departments of the Government. The Honorable JOHN ROONEY, chairman of the subcommittee, who comes from the State of New York, was unusually considerate of all members of the committee, and I assure you he had the unanimous cooperation of the two members of the minority and the other members of the majority. Especially, I want to commend the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, of Georgia; and the Honorable CLIFF CLEVINGER, of Ohio. Every member of this committee is a world traveler and a majority have visited many of the American foreign posts and many of the installations and physical activities of all of the four departments for which this committee makes appropriations. Mr. Jay Howe, our executive secretary, has done a splendid service in aiding each member of the committee to better understand the bill, and because of his efficiency the work of the membership has been made lighter.

I wish it were possible for each Member of the House to read all four volumes of the hearings in connection with this requested appropriation. It deals with every phase of the State Department and our Foreign Service, which I have always considered should be our first line of defense; all of the sections of the Department of Justice, including that great investigatory division known as the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the gigantic Department of Commerce with its many, many sections of domestic activities plus the foreign and domestic commerce and this year dealing with the Bureau of Public Roads; and finally, our Federal Judiciary. The bill contains the salaries for nearly 96,000 permanent employees and also the salaries for the approximately 150,000 temporary census takers who will start their work this month.

You will find the report for this bill beginning on page 31 of the combined hearings and the break-down of items for all four departments beginning on page 54. You will note that every regular item in the bill shows a decrease under the President's budget request with the exception of the amount allowed for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is the full budget estimate; and in regard to this item, you will find an explanation in the hearing as to the importance of this agency. I will have more to say about this agency later as we start reading the bill for amendments. Suffice to say, however, that this bill shows a reduction of over \$98,000,000 under the budget request, including contract authorizations and nearly \$20,000,000 under the appropriations for the present fiscal year.

I feel that in presenting these figures and this bill, this committee has made some contribution to the demand of the public to economize, to approach the

time when we can balance the budget and pay something on our public debt. In spite of this statement, I am sure there are items in this bill which could be reduced further, but as is always customary by compromise, we have come to an agreement that this is the best possible figure we can present to the House at this time, and we present it for your consideration and will be glad to discuss any question or amendment which may be asked or offered.

In presenting this bill and in spite of the large decrease made by the committee, I am not unmindful of the fact that the public debt of our Nation now has exceeded \$260,000,000,000, that the one-package appropriations bill before you presently gives no hope to balance the budget. I am not unmindful of the fact also that the interest on our public debt has exceeded \$5,000,000,000 annually, which is more than it used to cost not so long ago to run the entire Government of the United States, and that it costs \$50,000,000 more a year to administer our public debt, and that the figures submitted in the omnibus bill indicate that if the bill would be passed by the House and eventually passed by the Senate and signed by the President, we will still be faced with a deficit for the coming fiscal year of more than \$5,000,000,000.

I recommend the membership's attention to page 6 of the hearings which are in your possession and look at the figures headed "Recommended in bill." These totals indicate that while your full committee has reduced the President's budget request by \$1,385,000,000, the expense of running all phases of Government during the next fiscal year will still be more than \$41,000,000,000, with no prospect of balancing the budget or paying on the public debt. Therefore, I hope that as each chapter of this bill is presented to the House, the membership will continue its attendance in the debates, and also when the bill is read for amendment; so if there is a possibility of further reductions without injuring the necessary functions of Government, some additional savings can be made. I tell you this because the revenues for our Government for the fiscal year 1951 are estimated at only \$37,305,586,034, compared with over \$40,000,000,000 expenditures. While this income estimate was made in late autumn and our committee has been advised that the agencies which make these estimates will not be able to make a closer one at present, I feel the estimates are rather high if the reports of some of the income tax collectors in my part of the country prove accurate. These predictions indicate that the income tax return in the agricultural part of our country will be much lower than they were a year ago. So the budget, as it was presented to us originally, contemplated a net deficit of \$5,133,171,372. This gives you some idea why it is necessary for the membership to study this entire bill and why it is necessary to make additional reductions wherever possible.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], has gone into the figures on our section of the bill at

great length, and in order to save time, I will not go into them except when questions are asked and during the time permitted under the 5-minute rule. I will eliminate my usual discussion of each item in order to give other Members of the House an opportunity to speak on the bill because the time is limited to 2 hours divided between the chairman and myself as ranking minority member; so I shall yield as much of the 1 hour of time allotted to me to other Members because I know there are many items in the bill in which they are interested, and upon which they want to speak.

However, there have been several questions asked and I am prepared to answer them at this time. The first question was asked me a little while ago as to the authority for a statement I made in connection with criminal aliens who are presently in the United States. You will find most of that information documented in our hearings and the statement I made came from the documented hearing.

When the Immigration Service was before the committee, the item of deportable aliens was a matter of much discussion. During the fiscal year, it was stated that 2,000 aliens were deported, and it is estimated that the same number will be deported during the next fiscal year. The number of deportable aliens required to be deported during the present fiscal year was a little over 276,000 required to depart this year, and it is estimated 300,000 will be required to depart next year.

The committee was told that there are 3,000,000 to 3,500,000 aliens in the United States legally.

In the testimony, the matter of aliens who are in the United States from iron-curtain countries came up in the questioning of witnesses and it was stated by the Commissioner of Immigration that among those aliens who have been sentenced to be deported are 3,500 to 4,000 who must some time go back to the iron-curtain countries. These were sentenced to go back mostly to Poland, Russia, some to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Baltic States. The immigration people told the committee that they cannot deport these iron-curtain-country aliens because they cannot get a travel order to get them into the iron-curtain country; so they are left in the United States and are mixed with our citizens. There is not a careful check made of them; and among the 3,500, there are approximately 100 who are classed as subversive and members of the Communist Party. It is stated that the Immigration Section has no way of sending them back without travel documents and no steamship company will accept them as passengers if they cannot land them. So the United States is confronted with at least 100 of these subversives and Communist aliens who are either out on bond or parole and are allowed to roam the United States as they wish.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Why are these people who are Communists allowed to be out on

bail? That hardly sounds like good practice on the part of the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. I was going to say that it was stated by Mr. Miller, the Immigration Commissioner, that many of these hundred alien Communists and subversives seem to be well fixed with money and he knows of no way of getting rid of them. However, there is some legislation before the House that is designed to correct this situation. This would authorize the Immigration Commissioner to keep these people under surveillance or detain them. At the present time, the Immigration people do not know where all of them are located.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that testimony was given to his committee to the effect that these aliens are buying their way?

Mr. STEFAN. I do not know anything about that. These 100 aliens who have been found guilty of some criminal act come from behind the iron curtain and are Communists and subversives. They are out on bond or parole and because a travel order cannot be obtained for them, they cannot land in the iron-curtain countries, and they are traveling over our country at will. What I meant by "well supplied with money" was that testimony was given to us by the Commissioner of Immigration indicating that they appeared to be well supplied with money. Where all of them are, we do not know, but they are running all over the United States.

You will recall when this bill was brought up I took the floor and gave you detailed information as to other sources of entry by subversives and aliens who are in our country presently illegally.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentleman from Nebraska read the speech made in Chicago last Friday by Gen. Omar Bradley when he said, in speaking of undercover agents in our country, "Never before has our country been threatened so much from within."

Mr. STEFAN. It was for that reason I took the floor the other day and went into detail, giving documented evidence as to the entry of these aliens into our country, who are running around the country without surveillance at the present time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES. I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska for bringing us the information that he did some days ago with respect to this alarming problem. He has called our attention to the fact that we do have thousands of alien Communists in this country, that we do not even know presently where they are. As I understand it, our officers would have difficulty in even attempting to try to locate them.

Mr. STEFAN. It was for that reason, I may say, that this committee strengthened the arm of the FBI, which is our only method of keeping in contact with those people.

Mr. REES. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman wanted to know something about the international organizations?

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman explain that, please?

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the hearings on appropriations for the Department of State will disclose the fact that our participation in various international organizations are growing by leaps and bounds and it is absolutely necessary to eliminate some duplication and cut down the number of these organizations for the sake of economy. The budget officers for the Department of State who come before our committee each year indicate that they are practically powerless to cut down appropriations for these activities because the organizations are set up through authorizations or treaties, and your committee finds it rather difficult to make any reductions in appropriations because of the commitments made before the appropriations are requested.

During the fiscal year 1949, the United States participated in 47 organizations involving a total outlay of \$144,629,262. Of this amount, over \$128,000,000 represented actual contributions to the permanent and temporary organizations; over \$3,000,000 represented the cost of the United States missions at the seat of international organizations and the cost of the United States participation in meetings of international organizations; more than \$1,000,000 was expended for entertainment or representation at occasional meetings of miscellaneous international groups and special assignments; over \$11,000,000 represented an advance to the United Nations toward a \$65,000,000 loan.

During that same fiscal year, the United States participated in approximately 258 conferences involving some 6,000 meetings. Of this number, 52 were concerned with the United Nations, 105 with specialized agencies, 13 with the Inter-American Organization, 14 with other international organizations, and 11 with temporary organizations. In addition, there were 63 miscellaneous conferences. Of the 6,000 meetings attended by representatives of this Government, more than 3,000 grew out of conferences of the United Nations and the specialized agencies built in New York, Geneva, Paris, London, Montreal, Shanghai, and other places throughout the world. These proceedings involved 8,000 official documents with operations conducted in five authorized languages.

The United States is paying the biggest percentage of cost for activities of these various international organizations, and instead of increasing our cost, some study should be made toward a further reduction. It has been found that the assessed United States percentage share in the international organizations has been considerable and range from about 2 percent in some cases to approximately 70 percent in other cases, and that if the total amount of the United States dollar contributions to the 45 organizations to which it contributed

during 1949 is equated with the total amount of assessments against all members of the organizations, the United States' contribution percentage amounts to over 47 percent. The United States contribution percentage in the case of the International Childrens Emergency Fund amounts to 72 percent of the total; in case of IRO, 45 percent; in case of United Nations Relief for Palestine Arab Refugees, our percentage was 54 percent; and when you take the three together, it is found the United States' percentage amounted to 50.77 percent. Furthermore, the United States' contributions to these three programs in combination amounted to about 80 percent of the dollar cost of our contributions to all international organizations during fiscal year 1949, although our assessments to the 10 Inter-American organizations to which the United States contributed are at a higher figure of over 65 percent.

I call your attention to Report No. 1275 entitled "The United States Relations with International Organizations," which is a report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments pursuant to Public Law 609 in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I recommend close reading of the report because it indicates to me that we should hesitate in passing any new legislation to increase our percentage cost to international organizations, and we should go rather slow in increasing the number of organizations instead of combining present ones with necessary new ones in order to effect some economy and also some efficiency.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that I would deeply appreciate having a copy of that document. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. REES. The gentleman just referred to the amount of the expenditure for representations. I would appreciate having that figure once more.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we will go into item after item when we read the bill for amendment. It is approximately \$1,300,000, and it is scattered throughout the bill.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman care to comment about that? Does he not think it is a little too high?

Mr. STEFAN. Our committee cut it down some. I hope the gentleman will be satisfied with reductions we have made.

Mr. REES. I am afraid I will not be quite satisfied. Somewhere along the line there will be an amendment offered to reduce it further.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I take advantage of this opportunity to pay my respects to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I wish to pay him a compliment he deserves and which he will modestly, I hope, accept, that the committee and the House are very fortunate in having him to represent them, a man who understands and can speak different lan-

guages. Those who talk in whispers on the outside at his hearings do not get by old KARL.

We understand each other in four different languages, principally when he talks in English, when as always he forcefully represents a farm district as do I. To it and to its welfare he has devoted his entire career in the House in an effort to help the farmers of the Nation, particularly those of his Nebraska district and their wives and children. Such service as he has so faithfully rendered is not too often the pay-off for those who support such a man as KARL STEFAN is, as in his case. I believe he has done more for the farmers of Nebraska and his district than could have been done by anybody else.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his compliment and deeply appreciate it.

There is one item in this bill that I think will be scattered throughout the entire omnibus bill carrying appropriations for the Government for the fiscal year 1951, and that is the matter of annual leave which is bothering so many Government employees and Members of the House.

Some time ago I made a statement regarding the alarming growth in the accumulation of annual leave and sick leave among Federal employees. I do not advocate a decrease in the number of leave days allowed to Government employees. I merely call your attention to the fact that something will have to be done about paying up this annual leave in order that we can start each fiscal year at a more reasonable basis and eliminate the tremendous accumulation.

In the bill we present to you today making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal judiciary there have been accumulated 7,356,968 days of annual leave and sick leave, and the cost of that when reckoned in dollars is around \$116,814,804. This is in these four departments alone, and I predict that if all of the annual leave and sick leave of all the other departments of Government were totaled today, it would run into many more millions of days and the total cost will run to more than \$1,000,000,000.

Federal employees are allowed 15 days sick leave every year, but in this case they are not paid for sick leave but must take it or eventually lose it. But in the matter of annual leave, it is accumulated and represents cash outlay. Employees are allowed 26 days a year annual leave. In these four departments, the accumulated annual leave represents 3,573,163 days, and this represents approximately \$60,000,000 which the Government owes these employees today. The accumulated sick leave in the four departments amounts to 3,783,805 days and also represents approximately \$60,000,000. If the committees who come before you with other appropriation bills for other departments have secured a break-down on accumulated leave and the cost of liquidation, we would be able to get an accurate figure of the tremendous amount of sick leave and annual leave and the tremendous amount of money represented in the cost of such liquida-

tion. I feel the problem is important enough to call your attention to it.

The accumulated leave in the four departments in this bill is divided as follows:

	Accumulated annual leave	Accumulated sick leave	Cost of liquidation
	Days	Days	
Justice Department.....	992,160	1,222,520	\$15,428,088
Commerce Department.....	1,380,661	1,617,966	19,010,186
State Department.....	1,127,945	848,197	25,249,859
Federal Judiciary.....	72,397	95,122	30,016,765
Total.....	3,573,163	3,783,805	13,947,293
			10,104,887
			1,291,607
			1,766,119
			116,814,804

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. In speaking of accumulated leave the gentleman referred to it as "days of leave." I believe, however, that it is generally thought of not as days of leave, but as accumulated in cash and that the time which accumulated during the employment of a Federal employee at a lower rate of pay is paid for in the higher rate of pay at the time the employee finally takes his leave, which makes quite a difference.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that. I have got this down to days and to cash also. I have this down to 3,573,163 days of annual leave and 3,783,805 days of sick leave. I have got it down to cash of over \$116,000,000 in these four departments alone.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. But the point I am making and the real question is that in effect the employee has, intentionally or unintentionally, actually raised his own salary without action of the Congress or of his superiors when he takes the leave at the higher rate of pay which he gets at the end of the time.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 8, noes 36. So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count on the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that a quorum is not present. [After counting.] Sixty-nine members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Allen, Calif.	Barrett, Pa.	Bentsen
Allen, La.	Battle	Blackney
Barden	Bennett, Fla.	Boykin

Buckley, N. Y.	Hill	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hollifield	Quinn
Burdick	Hope	Ramsay
Byrne, N. Y.	Irving	Rivers
Carroll	Johnson	Rogers, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Cavalcante	Kelly, N. Y.	Sabath
Celler	Keogh	Sadowski
Chelf	Kilday	Sasser
Cole, Kan.	Klein	Scott, Hugh, D., Jr.
Colmer	Kunkel	Shelley
Cooley	Lichtenwalter	Sheppard
Crosser	McConnell	Short
Davenport	McKinnon	Simpson, Pa.
Davies, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.	Smathers
Dawson	Macy	Smith, Kan.
DeGraffenried	Mansfield	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Miles	Stanley
Douglas	Miller, Md.	Steed
Doyle	Monroney	Tauriello
Fellows	Morrison	Thompson
Fogarty	Moulder	Tollefson
Gamble	Multer	Towe
Gilmer	Murphy	Underwood
Gorski	Murray, Wis.	Velde
Granger	Nelson	Walter
Grant	Nixon	Whitaker
Green	Norton	White, Idaho
Gwinn	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Harris	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Harrison	O'Neill	Withrow
Hart	Pace	Wood
Havener	Patten	Woodhouse
Hébert	Pfeifer,	
Heffernan	Joseph L.	
Herter	Phillips, Calif.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 317 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, among the other items in this bill there is the item for the tentative Federal airport extension program for the fiscal year 1951. It will be recalled that last year when we brought this bill up for consideration many of you asked the membership of this committee where the airport money is to be allocated in your various districts. This year we again have funds requested for continuing the Federal airport program. There is an airport program in every one of your States and perhaps your districts. A list of the airports to be improved are contained in a volume which the committee has for your information at this time. It shows the name of every State and community and if any of you are interested in it you may look it over.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I ask the gentleman if he intends to put that list in the RECORD?

Mr. STEFAN. No, it is too voluminous. I suggest that the gentleman take it and look it over because it is here and it is set up by States and by communities, also it shows the amount of the tentative local contribution and the Federal contribution. I am sure every Member of the House will be interested in looking it over in order to inform his community as to what the tentative program is for the

next fiscal year, 1951, so far as Federal airports are concerned.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. This list of airports was released to the press some weeks ago, was it not?

Mr. STEFAN. I understand so, yes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. There has been considerable discussion with reference to the employees abroad. I do not recall the number of employees we have abroad for these various agencies but I am sure there are several thousand. In any event, can the gentleman give us that figure and will he tell us whether or not in his judgment these employees are reasonably well paid? Also tell us something about the allowances that are given to these employees in addition to their salaries.

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Kansas, let me say that I intended to take up that subject when we have the bill up for amendment under the 5-minute rule, but I may as well discuss it now as a reply to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the many features of the proposed appropriation to provide funds to cover the expenditures of various branches of our Government for the fiscal year 1951, I believe it would be of interest to the Members of the Congress to invite special attention to the cost of maintaining our Foreign Service which is charged with the duties of carrying on our negotiations with foreign governments in all their political and economic aspects.

It is frequently stated in the press, by commentators and even by some Members of Congress, that the inadequate compensation of members of our diplomatic service makes it necessary for many of them in key posts to possess private fortunes to enable them to serve our Government, or that the compensation offered does not attract persons of the highest caliber for rendering good service in protecting our interests in foreign affairs.

It is believed that a comparison of the total compensation received by members of our Foreign Service will disclose that members of no other branch of our Government services is as highly paid as members of the Foreign Service, and that the Congress has been most liberal in agreeing to requests for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Let us examine the annual amounts being paid to the members of our Foreign Service at the present time in order that the Members of Congress and other interested persons may compare them with the annual compensation and other benefits received by other employees of our Government.

I am told that a Foreign Service officer of class 1—not chief of mission, who is paid much more in most instances—at one of the most important posts, receives a salary of from \$12,000 to \$13,500 annually. In addition, if he has a family,

he receives allowances of \$3,500 annually for quarters, and a post allowance of from \$1,980 to \$2,040. A total of about \$19,000 annually, of which \$5,500 is free of United States income tax. He is given a liberal allowance for entertainment that in most cases fully covers all out-of-pocket expenses for any entertainment essential to his position. It must be remembered that the principal items of entertainment in foreign countries are beverages, which our officers obtain without taxes or import duties, enabling them to obtain a bottle of alcoholic beverage at about one-fourth the cost to others who do not enjoy diplomatic privileges. This same ratio of costs applies to cigarettes, gasoline, and other items purchased through tax-free privileges. Moreover, they have the privilege of purchasing many staple foods through Government commissaries; none of these privileges are enjoyed by other of our Government employees.

This same officer, with his family and household furniture and effects, is transported to his post at Government expense, and he is allowed a liberal per diem for himself and family to cover hotel expenses up to 30 days after arrival at his post. He is permitted to return to the United States with his family at Government expense every 2 years for 2 months' home leave, which accrues during his 2 years at his post. He also is permitted to take the usual annual leave or what is termed "post leave" while at his post, so that he is granted twice the amount of annual leave as other Government employees.

Hospital and medical services are provided to the officer and members of his family at Government expense.

Payments received for quarters and post allowances are exempt from United States income taxes.

If this officer is transferred to a post where the climate is the extreme "either hot or cold" from his previous assignment, he is paid a fixed amount for the purchase of clothing suitable for the exigencies of the climate. If he is transferred to a country whose currency based on the gold standard, is at a premium, as compared with United States currency, this differential amounting to as much in some countries as 60 percent, is added to his salary and allowances.

If he is assigned to what is classified as a hardship or unhealthy post, a further special allowance is granted.

So it will be observed that when the sum total of compensation, allowances, and the various benefits and privileges granted to members of our Foreign Service are taken into full consideration, it cannot be charged that the Congress has not been extremely liberal in making funds available for the Service, but on the other hand, employees in other branches of our Government service may, with justification, charge us with discriminatory treatment. Moreover, few persons with equal experience and qualifications employed in industry are so well paid.

However, the apparently excessive cost of our Foreign Service might be justified if the taxpayers were receiving full value in services rendered rather than have the prestige of our great Nation impaired vis-à-vis other powers as has been the

case during the past several years, as a result of some obvious inefficient and ineffective plans and policies devised and executed by our Foreign Service.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when I addressed the Committee of the Whole a while ago and commended my fellow Members of this subcommittee, I failed to mention in that commendation a very, very important individual, a very, very important man insofar as the arduous work of this subcommittee is concerned. He is the executive secretary of the subcommittee, Mr. Jay Howe, who is here sitting at my right. Were it not for the long and splendid work of Mr. Howe we would never have been able to get together the committee report which is now before you. We are indeed indebted to him.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, inadvertently neglected to mention our executive secretary, Mr. Howe, and I want to join the chairman and other members of the committee in paying tribute and my gratitude for the excellent and most efficient work rendered to our committee by Mr. Howe, our executive secretary.

Mr. ROONEY. I know that that expresses the thoughts of all members of this subcommittee.

A while ago the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made a statement about subversive aliens who were loose in this country without any information, on the part of the Immigration and Naturalization Service as to their present whereabouts. In that connection, I wish to read into the RECORD the testimony in regard thereto given by Mr. Watson Miller, the capable Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and by Mr. W. F. Kelly, assistant commissioner. This testimony is to be found beginning on page 298 of the committee hearings dealing with the Department of Justice:

Mr. STEFAN. Now, Mr. Commissioner, as regards to deportation of aliens, those to be deported back to their place of origin, those originated in countries behind the iron curtain?

Mr. MILLER. We almost universally fail to get travel documents from their respective countries.

Mr. STEFAN. How many do you have in the United States you cannot deport because they cannot have any place to go?

Mr. KELLY. I think we have between 3,500 and 4,000 total.

Mr. STEFAN. What country are they sentenced to be deported to?

Mr. KELLY. Well, the iron-curtain countries, Poland. The majority of cases are Russian cases.

Mr. STEFAN. Russia, Poland.

Mr. KELLY. Czechoslovakia, the Baltic states, Hungary, Poland, and so forth.

Mr. STEFAN. And you do not deport them because they cannot get a travel order to get into those countries, is that right?

Mr. KELLY. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. They are left here on bond?

Mr. KELLY. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Are they mixed up with our citizens?

Mr. KELLY. They are at large.

Mr. STEFAN. You do not know where they are, do you?

Mr. KELLY. Well, we do our best to keep them located.

Mr. STEFAN. What were they charged with?

Mr. KELLY. I think approximately a hundred cases were deportable under the act of 1918 as amended.

Mr. STEFAN. What is that?

Mr. KELLY. Former membership in proscribed organizations, subversive activities.

Mr. STEFAN. Communists and people with subversive ideas who believe in overthrowing government by force and violence, and you have no check on them, and they are scattered in society in the United States, is that true?

Mr. KELLY. We have them all under bond.

Mr. STEFAN. They are loose under bond?

Mr. KELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. How many?

Mr. KELLY. Approximately 100 in the group, and I cannot give you the breakdown as to causes of deportation as to the remainder, but many of these are criminals.

Mr. STEFAN. Here we have 3,500 aliens who have been sentenced to be deported back to where they came from, 100 of whom are people with subversive ideas. Why can you not send them back to Russia?

Mr. KELLY. We have no way of getting them back without travel documents, no steamship company will accept them as passengers if they cannot land them.

Mr. STEFAN. So we are helpless here in the United States and they are running at large. They believe in overthrowing our Government by force and violence.

Mr. MILLER. There are other types, like those hundred or more Hungarians that seem to be well fixed with money and that sort of thing. There is no way that I know of getting rid of them.

Mr. KELLY. There is legislation before the House that is designed to correct them.

Mr. STEFAN. What does that do?

Mr. KELLY. It would authorize us to keep them under surveillance or detain them.

Mr. STEFAN. You do not know where these 3,500 people are, do you?

Mr. KELLY. Not all of them.

Mr. STEFAN. They are scattered all over the United States, are they not?

Mr. KELLY. As to those who have complied with the alien registration law, we do have a record on them and I suppose we have a record on a substantial number; as to the subversives we have a record on each one of them.

There will then be found, beginning at page 300 of the hearings on the Department of Justice appropriations for 1951, a list containing the file number, name, country ordered deported to, amount of bond, and address of each of these aliens of the so-called subversive classes under orders of deportation unenforceable due to inability to procure travel documents.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman perchance know the status of the so-called remedial legislation? What committee has jurisdiction of it?

Mr. ROONEY. I would assume it would be the Committee on the Judiciary. As to the exact present status of the legislation mentioned by Mr. Kelly in his testimony I cannot report at this moment.

It might be well at this point to call to the attention of the members of the legislative committee that the hands of the Immigration and Naturalization

Service are tied unless they have some such legislation. I do not believe these subversives should be permitted to roam around the country, even though under bond.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree, and I commend the gentleman and his committee on bringing out these facts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it should be emphasized that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is not to blame.

Mr. ROONEY. They are not to blame. That is the point I make. You cannot hold them responsible if they do not have the jurisdiction or the funds, and have no legal right to hold these people.

Mr. McCORMACK. If additional legislation is necessary, that is the responsibility of the Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. It most certainly is.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The chairman of our subcommittee read the statistics a little while ago and referred to a table in the hearings in which he stated the Immigration Service had the address of those who are out on bond. If the gentleman will read further, he will find they are not all on bond, and that the hearings and table would indicate that some of them are on parole.

Mr. ROONEY. The table will indicate the exact situation with regard to each of these people by name.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, you have just heard from the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member about the concern we have had with the subversive and dangerous people whom we can do nothing with, even after we have convicted them. The five men on this subcommittee have certainly been assiduously applying themselves to routing out so far as lies in their power from the State and Commerce Departments these subversive people. Many of you may have lost sight of the fact that it was this subcommittee a couple of years ago which kicked some of these people out of the brush where the Committee on Un-American Activities could get action on them. There has been no partisanship in this committee in going after these subversive people.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any evidence or testimony before the gentleman's committee with respect to the number of people who were separated from the service in the Department of State who had later acquired positions in other departments of Government? I refer to those whose employment was considered a security risk. Was anything said before your committee on that subject?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I will say to the gentleman, I brought that question up a year ago, as to whether the other de-

partments would be alerted so that they might not hire these—we can name them now—these homosexuals. Until the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy, made that word public over in the other body, we had insufficient information so far as the committee was concerned and could not tell you. In reply to my question we were informed they were not, and unofficially we were told, or at least I was told, that they have been employed in other sections of the Government, at least most of them were.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason I asked that question is that I made inquiry by letter to find out where these people went and whether they are now employed by our Government and I have not yet received a reply giving me any information on the subject.

Mr. CLEVENGER. If the gentleman will look at the report he will find some information on that subject.

I am going to address myself now to conditions we have discovered in the Department of Commerce. When I asked the security officer if he would flag them, he said he would. I told him I was very much afraid he could not, because of an Executive order which was issued restricting the information being given on these people.

The air is full of stories. The press is full of stories. I am not passing on that.

In discussing the constitutionality of the so-called loyalty program, John Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, had occasion to cite a decision of the circuit court of appeals rendered on August 11, 1949, involving the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee. A portion of that decision is worthy of repetition here:

Contrary to the contentions of the committee, nothing in the Hatch Act or the loyalty program deprives the committee or its members of any property rights. Freedom of speech and assembly is denied no one. Freedom of thought and belief is not impaired. Anyone is free to join the committee and give it his support and encouragement. Everyone has the constitutional right to do these things, but no one has a constitutional right to be a Government employee.

For emphasis permit me to repeat the last phrase, "but no one has a constitutional right to be a Government employee."

It seems to me that the crux of our entire security program lies in that phrase. It is indeed a privilege and certainly not a right to work for the Government and it is time we cleared the air on the misconceptions of a good many well-intentioned people who have been misled by the propaganda of the Communist and the fellow traveler into the belief that the burden of "proof of qualification" lies on the employer in this case, the Government, rather than on the employee. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Government has the right, nay the obligation, to set up standards for performance of duty not only for prospective employees but for those already on the rolls. This sacred obligation to the taxpayer implies the summary removal of any employee who does not measure up to these standards, the walls and crocodile tears of the fuzzy-minded to the contrary

notwithstanding. It is tragically true that our present administration has been sadly lacking in the courage or capacity necessary to carry out these obligations but this does not excuse, or in no way alter or mitigate these obligations.

We have heard a great deal in recent weeks concerning the security risks within the Department of State and I would like to say that while I am not familiar with the charges being bandied about I think the basic issue has been somewhat obscured in the unfortunate partisanship that has developed in this inquiry that is of prime importance to every American, Republican or Democrat.

The sob sisters and thumb-sucking liberals are crying for proof of disloyalty in the form of overt acts, on any security risks who are being removed from the Government rolls, but shed no tears for the lives lost as a result of the activities of the Hiss', Coplon's, and the Wadleigh's, all of whom would or did pass the loyalty standards with flying colors.

I wish the American people would keep in mind the fact that a security risk does not have to be a member of the Communist Party or even of a Communist-front organization. It is not only conceivable but highly probable that many security risks are loyal Americans; however, there is something in their background that represents a potential possibility that they might succumb to conflicting emotions to the detriment of the national security. Perhaps they have relatives behind the iron curtain and thus would be subject to pressure. Perhaps they are addicted to an overindulgence in alcohol or maybe they are just plain garrulous. The most flagrant example is the homosexual who is subject to the most effective blackmail. It is an established fact that Russia makes a practice of keeping a list of sex perverts in enemy countries and the core of Hitler's espionage was based on the intimidation of these unfortunate people.

Despite this fact however, the Under Secretary of State recently testified that 91 sex perverts had been located and fired from the Department of State. For this the Department must be commended. But have they gone far enough? Newspaper accounts quote Senate testimony indicating there are 400 more in the State Department and 4,000 in Government. Where are they? Who hired them? Do we have a cell of these perverts hiding around Government? Why are they not ferreted out and dismissed? Does the Department of State have access to information in the files of the Washington Police Department? Are we to assume that the State Department has a monopoly on this problem? What are the other Departments of Government doing about this?

For years we had a public prejudice against mentioning in public such loathsome diseases as gonorrhea and cancer. In effecting cures for these maladies the medical people recognized the first step was in public education. These matters were brought before the public and frankly discussed and it was not until then that progress was really made. It is time to bring this homosexual problem

into the open and recognize the problem for what it is.

The Commerce Department hearings are somewhat enlightening in regard to the entire security problem and I would suggest that interested Members read them in detail beginning on page 2260.

Here we find that the Commerce Department has not located any homosexuals in their organization. Are we to believe that in the face of the testimony of the District of Columbia police that 75 percent of the 4,000 perverts in the District of Columbia are employed by the Government, that the Department of Commerce has none?

What is wrong with this loyalty program that does not uncover these matters, and when it does, adopts an attitude of looking for proof of disloyalty in the form of overt acts rather than elements of security risk? Is it not possible for the Government to refuse employment on the grounds of lack of qualifications where risk is apparent? This is not necessarily an indictment or conviction; it is merely the exercise of caution for the common welfare.

Our Commerce hearings detail one case in the Bureau of Standards where the chief of an important group was not cleared for 15 months and was in the ridiculous position of being denied access to certain areas, where classified work was being performed, while at the same time his subordinate employees enjoyed full access. I do not know the reason for the 15-month delay and what security risks were involved, but I do know that if serious matters of this type are not more quickly resolved, I for one, lack confidence in this system.

Note further, in these hearings that 369 loyalty investigations acquitted 273 but despite this action of the Loyalty Board the Commerce Department still considers 26 of these individuals to be security risks and must keep them under some kind of surveillance to insure that they will not yield to their temptations and turn over State secrets to emissaries of the Communist horde. This is a horrible example of the inability of the administration to deal with probably our most pressing problem.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wish to repeat a statement made in Chicago last Friday by Gen. Omar Bradley. He said: "Never before has our country been threatened so much from within"; and he was speaking then of the under-cover spies in our country.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I agree with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman called attention to the fact that there is included in this bill insofar as the Department of Commerce is concerned a rider which would permit the Secretary of Commerce to summarily dismiss anyone who might be connected with subversive activity?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I just mentioned that.

Mr. ROONEY. And will the gentleman kindly explain to the House that this rider is legislation on an appropriation bill, that it is subject to a point of order, but that the Committee unanimously hopes that no Member of this House will rise as the bill is being read for amendment to make a point of order against it.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I agree with my Chairman; and I should dislike to be the individual who had the temerity to move to strike it out of this bill.

In this bill we are providing almost \$15,000,000,000 for national defense yet we lack the capacity to separate from the service individuals whose combined machinations could well negate this entire expenditure.

I am happy to say that our committee has, in this bill, provided the means for the Department of Commerce to terminate these security risks without further ado, embarrassment, or red tape and if this provision is adopted by the House, I hope to see some forthright action in this regard.

I could perhaps do more than read to the House one portion of the testimony of Mr. Gladieux, of the Department of Commerce, to illustrate the lack of competence of the loyalty review system—page 2243:

The investigation has been completed and the adjudication of the case has been completed in varying terms; some only a month ago and some perhaps as long as 2 years ago. But they have been completed and for loyalty purposes the employees in question have been adjudged not disloyal. But we, in our own discretion in the Department of Commerce, have determined that notwithstanding the clearance as to loyalty, they are security risks.

I might say that we are probably on very dubious grounds in this whole security business. It has bothered a lot of us because we have no authority to designate someone as a security risk. For example, when the Loyalty Review Board clears an individual on appeal and does not find reasonable grounds for believing he is disloyal—in some cases we then say, "All right, we have to accept that position as to loyalty, but in our own discretion we are going to designate the employee as a security risk even so." We have no authority to do that and I always feared that it could be challenged successfully. This unclear situation does lead us into all kinds of complications when it comes to reductions in force, transferring people off security work, and other personnel actions.

Quotations of this type are scattered throughout the testimony indicating the lack of confidence that is prevalent in the efficiency of the loyalty system.

It sometimes appears to me that in our zeal to protect the rights of the individual we neglect the welfare of the Nation. No individual is bigger than our broad objectives. I am not suggesting a lessening of individuals' rights but I am suggesting that history has shown that great nations lost their freedom by an unrealistic interpretation of the rights of those who achieved their ends by an abuse of privilege and thereafter destroyed the rights that permitted them to achieve their nefarious ends. Let us not overemphasize tolerance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am pleased to note that the committee is going to put a rider on this bill similar to the McCarran amendment. I think it should be put on some of the other bills.

A few weeks ago I spoke on the subject of homosexuality. Within the last 10 days a gentleman from CIA told me that Mr. Goering of Germany and others had a complete list of all the homosexuals in the State Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Defense and that they knew who to contact when they came over here on espionage missions. The danger of spies, the danger of blackmail, their fear of blackmail, has caused those people to sabotage our Government. It was an interesting angle to me. I do know from very extensive reading the last few weeks that the Russians rather glory in the accomplishments resulting from homosexuality and they undoubtedly have the same list of homosexuals who were in key positions in Government in this country, so they knew who to contact when they came here. They are like birds of a feather, they flock together. I hope that the amendment will stay in and I think a similar amendment should be in all the bills that deal with these sensitive Government positions. As a physician I recognize that some of these people are more to be pitied than censured. They are pathological cases, like the kleptomaniac or the pyromaniac, but certainly they have no business being in sensitive positions of the Government where foreign agents seeking out our secrets can contact them and use them as a weapon to destroy our form of Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] who just spoke, realizes that this rider is already in the bill now before the House and is to be found at page 84, section 305. It reads as follows:

Sec. 305. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I knew the amendment was in there and I hope the Secretary makes full use of it. I think he should. I think the same amendment ought to be in other bills that come before this Congress.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps some Members may have wondered sometimes when I have voted in the negative so far as expenditure bills are concerned; however, it has gotten to the point with me that I am against any-

thing that we can do without but which, if agreed to, will add to the deficit that faces our country. I do want to say, though, that for 3 years this subcommittee has restored various cuts of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We have restored to that agency cuts made by the Bureau of the Budget and have given it the full request. I believe with all my heart that the greatest national defense this country has in this hour is the Federal Bureau of Investigation that can lay its hands on thousands of these dangerous people on a moment's notice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the particular attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and to the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that in the testimony of Mr. Boykin, of the Department of State, at page 672 of the committee hearings, part 1, Department of State appropriation for 1951, eleventh line from the bottom of the page, there is this answer:

Mr. BOYKIN. Yes, sir.

As a matter of fact, that answer of Mr. Boykin was "No, sir." This is a typographical error, is that not so, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], I will say that the answer should have been printed "No, sir." The error was typographical.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had more time in which to get together all of the things I think about to talk about a lot of things that have been discussed the last few days. Fortunately for myself, but probably unfortunately for those who served under me or lived with me, for 14 years while I was president of a university. In that group we had homosexuals, but we did not advertise the fact. We did not make it known to the world at large that there were such extroverts and such people as would divert and so divorce themselves from natural laws as to indulge in these unnatural practices to which allusion has been made. I regret very much that it has become so common to discuss to attract the attention of those of high senses, not intellectuals, but of ordinary capacity to the end that they are induced to know what all is going on among those who divert their attention to the base passions of human nature about which the less said the better. It all sets down to the impossibility of changing human nature, which is not a matter to be accomplished by legislation, if ever.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about the manner in which the members of this subcommittee worked during the months, day and night, that we spent in listening to the

testimony that produced about 3,000 pages of records of these three great departments of this Government, the State Department, the Justice Department and the Federal Judiciary, and the Department of Commerce. Of course, the record for appropriations for the judiciary itself is largely appropriating money pro forma because of the action of the various legislative committees. There is not a great deal except in detail that this committee can do as far as our jurisdiction goes.

I should like to make this observation as the result of one I made a year ago when this bill was before the House. Many of my colleagues on the subcommittees and the legislative committees concurred with me. We noticed this year that the department heads and the bureau chiefs have finally taken our instructions and have not meddled with and have not changed and have not inserted contradictions or entirely different versions in their testimony. As a lawyer, there was nothing that used to offend me more than to see testimony come back from a department head or a bureau chief in such a condition that you would never recognize it. That offends the soul of a trial lawyer. I think that under the insistence of the chairman of this committee and our members we may have finally driven into the heads of the people downtown that when you make a statement before a committee up here you are supposed to leave it alone. "That is what you said, and you do no second guessing and sending us back something else." This year I think I can say that they have pretty generally complied.

I should like to point this out. This subcommittee have labored long and well to cut down, to lower the appropriations set up in budget requests under the jurisdiction of this committee. On both sides of the aisle this subcommittee have been unanimous. They worked together well and they concurred in these things. I think this committee and this House should know how well these able men did this job, and I can speak for them.

I want you to know that there is a reduction in the cash appropriations of \$19,997,177 in this subcommittee's bill below the appropriations for these departments for the current fiscal year. In addition, this subcommittee has reduced the budget estimates. We have cut the budget estimates \$73,000,000. We are recommending \$73,000,000 less than the budget recommended to the Appropriations Committee. That is a milestone in this kind of work. The action of this committee is second to none. These are important Government departments, State, Justice, and Commerce, of great importance. Long and well we have analyzed these requests, and we have cut them. In many cases we may have cut too deeply, perhaps. In other cases perhaps more could have been cut. But the over-all effort of this committee is sound, well reasoned, and to the best interests of the Government and the taxpayers.

It is not the purpose of the members of this subcommittee, as you may have noticed, at this time, to dwell upon the

various subdivisions of this long and important bill. We will devote ourselves, as we understand it, to these matters as they arise for amendment or during the reading of the bill from now on.

There has been a lot of inquiry, I have received a lot of mail about it, and I understand from the secretary of our subcommittee that there seems to be the impression that we have cut the United Nations appropriation. That is not so. Wherever they got that idea I have not the faintest idea. We did not cut the United Nations appropriation. This subcommittee has recommended every penny that has been asked for the United Nations.

There is a small reduction of \$36,000 only with reference to the Commissions to International Organizations, but that can be well absorbed. It deals not only with the United Nations Commissions, but with a series of others. Any cuts they may have in mind, and this may be the source of the confusion, are the cuts that have to do with international contingencies. These are appropriations for our delegations to international conferences and to provide for commissions, or are contributions to what may happen in future, in the field of international conferences or delegations.

But we have not cut the appropriation to the United Nations and I would like to cure at this time that error. And I purposefully want to close my remarks with the statement that the employees of the State Department are as loyal, and as hard working and as devoted to the best interest of this Nation and its form of government, as any group of employees in any department in the Federal or any other service. America and the world is fortunate that Dean Acheson is now our Secretary of State and that John Puerifoy, his Deputy Undersecretary of State, is serving in that vital and important capacity. These are patriotic Americans the equal of any man in the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and I ask for tellers on the motion.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. CANFIELD.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 28, noes 49. So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 135]

Allen, Calif.	Andresen,	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	August H.	Battle
Anderson,	Barden	Bennett, Fla.
Calif.	Barrett, Pa.	Blackney

Boggs, Del.	Green	Nelson
Boggs, La.	Gwinn	Nixon
Boiling	Hall,	Norton
Bosone	Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.
Boykin	Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.
Breen	Harris	O'Neill
Buchanan	Harrison	Pace
Buckley, N. Y.	Hart	Patten
Bulwinkle	Havener	Powell
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Rains
Carroll	Heffernan	Rivers
Case, N. J.	Herter	Rogers, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Heselton	Roosevelt
Cavalcante	Hill	Sabath
Chelf	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadowski
Cole, Kans.	Hollifield	Sasser
Colmer	Hope	Scott,
Cooley	Irving	Hugh D., Jr.
Cox	Jennings	Scudder
Crosser	Johnson	Shafer
Dague	Jones, N. C.	Shelley
Davenport	Kearns	Short
Davies, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	Keogh	Smathers
Deane	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
DeGraffenried	Klein	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Kunkel	Stanley
Douglas	Larcade	Tauriello
Doyle	Lichtenwalter	Thomas
Eaton	Linehan	Thompson
Engle, Calif.	McCarthy	Tollefson
Fallon	McConnell	Towe
Fellows	McKinnon	Underwood
Fernandez	McMillen, Ill.	Velde
Fisher	Macy	Vinson
Fogarty	Mansfield	Walter
Fulton	Miles	Whitaker
Gamble	Miller, Md.	White, Idaho
Garmatz	Mills	Wickersham
Gillette	Monroney	Willis
Gilmer	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Gorski	Moulder	Withrow
Granger	Multer	Wood
Grant	Murphy	Woodhouse
	Murray, Wis.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 285 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a few observations I would like to make about the chapter of the bill now under consideration. First, however, I would like to say that in the mind of the average Member of Congress who has not had an opportunity to serve on the Committee on Appropriations there might arise some question of doubt about the thoroughness with which the problem is approached. I have heard doubts expressed by various Members about the effectiveness of the Committee on Appropriations when it comes to the proposition of bringing about economy. Before I was privileged to serve on this committee, I entertained some doubt about the efficiency of the committee and also as to how thoroughly the field under the jurisdiction of the respective subcommittees was explored by each committee. Since serving on the committee all doubt has been completely dissipated. For the almost 3 months that this chapter was

under consideration the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] subjected witness after witness to the most searching examinations in an effort to bring forth the truth about the departments being interrogated. Time and again he elicited information most valuable in nature which enabled us to apply effective cuts. I stand here today completely convinced as one who believes in economy that this bill has been intelligently cut to the bone by the subcommittee and any further reductions would endanger the effective operations of the departments under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

I would like to make some comment about the Department of State. The Department of State has been made the whipping boy of the Congress for many years and no doubt will in the future because it deals with foreign countries. It is constantly involved in international difficulties. It takes positions sometimes not consistent with the views of individual Members of the Congress. It has been recently severely criticized by many people on the ground that there were within the Department many people subversive in nature. Devastating and serious charges have been made. These charges are wide in scope. Our subcommittee has taken cognizance of these charges. Last year and this year we looked into these charges without fanfare or publicity but strictly behind closed doors. We have made no public utterances about our findings. We earnestly and seriously sought to ascertain the truth with respect to these charges. As one who believes himself to be reasonably conservative I do not accept or believe in the main the charges that have been made against the Department of State. First of all I want to say that the man responsible for the employees of the State Department is a man by the name of John E. Peurifoy. No finer or more loyal American is employed in the United States Government than Mr. Peurifoy. He was chosen by General Marshall to head up the personnel section of the State Department, knowing that it was a very difficult job. He requested this man and placed him in that position and gave him unlimited authority. As far as anyone has been able to ascertain, not a single instance has been established where the judgment of John E. Peurifoy proved to be faulty.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has he passed upon the character of these other people, aside from Communists, who admittedly have been in the various departments?

Mr. PRESTON. To which group do you allude?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I refer to the unmentionables.

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, you mean the people that Dr. MILLER has talked about so much on the floor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, now, you know and I know and every Member knows

that nobody is going around snooping around trying to find homosexuals in any department in the United States Government. You know and I know that if one is discovered he is going to be discharged.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not know that. You said, "I know." I do not know that.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, I feel the gentleman has been around Washington long enough to know that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman from Michigan has been around Washington long enough to know that. The gentleman from Michigan knows, I am sure, that the percentage of homosexuals uncovered in the State Department is no higher than will be found in any other large organization in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, I cannot agree with that.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, you will find a certain percentage—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I do not believe the percentage is anything like that which you find here. I have been here long enough to know that these charges have been rumored around here for the last 10 years, and from time to time various committees have uncovered it, but they still continue on the pay roll. I cannot countenance that.

Mr. PRESTON. The thing we should be doing is commending Mr. Puerifoy for having initiative to tackle that problem and solve it within his own Department. It cannot be said that it has been tackled in any other department of the Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that this is no news at all to this committee? As far back as 3 years ago the State Department was being cleared of those people.

Mr. PRESTON. It is true. Mr. Puerifoy testified in closed session 3 years ago, if I remember correctly, and certainly last year, that this problem was being attacked and solved within the State Department.

Now, if you want to make capital of something, if you will refer to the hearings and read what was said about the Commerce Department, it might even be more startling than what has been said about the State Department.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have not been snooping around about the business, but when they begin to publish it in the newspapers my folks want to know who I am associating with down here and now long they are going to keep those fellows on the pay roll and use the taxpayers' money to pay them. That is bad business.

Mr. PRESTON. I agree it is bad business, and I do not think any Member of

the House would condone that for a minute.

Now, let me say this about the State Department: Not in a single case since the war ended has the Congress of the United States failed to follow the recommendations and policies established by the State Department, even through the Eightieth Congress when the Republicans were in charge of the Congress. You would believe from what you read in the papers and what is so loosely said by some people in high position in Washington that nothing goes on in the State Department but a continuing conspiracy to undermine the United States Government. We found no such condition to prevail in the investigation that our subcommittee has made.

We have offered no criticism, but on the other hand we have complimented Mr. Puerifoy for the fine job he has done within the State Department. So long as he remains there as Under Secretary, I, for one, feel safe in the belief that the State Department will be as free from subversives as any other agency in the United States Government.

In the course of the hearings we developed many things of interest that we think at the proper time should be brought to the attention of the House. Time will not permit me this afternoon to go into many, but there is one I should like to mention. For the first time in our committee we considered public roads and had public roads under our jurisdiction. We ascertained upon close examination of Mr. MacDonald that although a survey has been made to establish a military highway encircling the United States and crossing it, nothing has been done to implement this plan for such a highway; we have no four-lane highways in this country on which to move our vast armies and military equipment in the event of an emergency. We have highways so narrow that two of our larger-type prime movers could not pass each other on the highways. We have done nothing about implementing the program that was wisely suggested and authorized at one time by Congress—that is to the extent that a survey should be begun. It is my personal opinion that we should give serious thought to implementing that program. We should give serious thought to implementing the recommendations that have been made on this subject of establishing a four-lane military highway that would enable us to move our military vehicles in the event of an emergency.

Another thing that was brought forcefully to my attention was the fact that the time had arrived when it is necessary to separate in all of our transportation agencies, the ICC and the CAB, the promotional functions from the rate-making functions. I believe that the time has come when we should establish within the Department of Commerce a division of transportation and take away completely from these other agencies that have under their jurisdiction transportation, all promotional functions and place them under the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further general debate the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 24 on page 32.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NOTE OF THE UNITED STATES TO RUSSIA ON THE SINKING OF AN AMERICAN PLANE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to utilize this time to commend the Department of State for the temper and the quality of the note addressed to Soviet Russia with reference to the shooting down of an unarmed American plane over the open Baltic Sea. I believe I express the sentiments of this House when, I, with emphasis, repeat that I pay compliment to the distinguished Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, for the nature of that note and the quality of that note, its strength, force, and determination in making clear to the Soviet that the American position is clear and united.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the award posthumously of an appropriate decoration to members of the crew of the United States Navy Privateer, who lost their lives in or over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950, while in the performance of duty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks on the subject of wildlife management.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a resolution by the executive council of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor.

Mr. LODGE (at the request of Mr. STEFAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. STEFAN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized for 1 hour.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Members that the subject I intend to discuss merits the attention of every Member of this House. In the appropriation bill now before us we are being asked to contribute some \$14,000,000,000 to the military defense of our country. I am going to vote for that appropriation. I know nothing else to do. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States say that this is the irreducible minimum with which the interests of the United States of America can be protected and safeguarded at home and abroad. Who am I to say that I know more about what it takes to protect the interests of the United States of America at home and abroad than do the distinguished gentlemen I have just mentioned and our President of the United States. I have got to vote for that appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, you know Napoleon found out years ago that an army marched on its stomach and when a nation reaches the place that it cannot feed an army, and many nations of the world have already reached that place, then is when the subject I want to discuss here this afternoon comes into focus.

What I wish to talk about is found on page 189, line 10, of the bill we have had so long under consideration and that we will probably have under consideration for some time to come. I refer to the \$282,000,000 appropriated for the PMA, soil conservation in the United States. Considering the things that the Federal Government is doing in other directions and the amount of appropriations for other things the world over, that \$282,000,000 is pitifully inadequate.

It is the one thing that is justified above all the other agricultural expenditures in the Nation at the present time, and I am thinking of offering an amendment when that section is considered before this House to raise the figure from two hundred and eighty-two to four hundred million dollars.

You know, we like to brag about our country; what a great Nation we are. We are the greatest Nation in the world at the present time, but we like to hook our thumbs in the armpits of our vests and say, "We did this. This is the result of American ingenuity; this greatness is due to the kind of Government we have; it is due to our superior knowledge." Now, that is only partly true. I think we have great ingenuity. We have the best form of Government in the world, but a government has to have something besides people to govern.

When you wake up in the morning, what do you want? You want your

toast, and bacon and eggs, and orange juice; that is what you want. Where does it come from? Why, the corner grocery store; they have got it down there. That is only part of the story.

It comes from the soil of the United States, and there never has been a nation of people since the dawn of history that has destroyed their natural resources and depleted their soil at the rate we have been doing and are doing in the United States. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, which is a very short time in the history of lost nations, the Thirteen Colonies had just won their independence and had started to form a nation, and everything from Pittsburgh, Pa., west, and part of the country east of Pittsburgh was nothing but a jungle, a wilderness, peopled with savages. We have taken over all of that country now and populated it out to the Pacific.

We say we are the greatest country in the world, which is true, but let me recall something to your minds. India, Korea, China, Manchuria, Formosa, Burma, Indochina, with their teeming populations, have only four-tenths of 1 acre of land that is fit to grow food per capita. We say that is Asia; those are the backward countries of the world, the countries that we need to help. And, I voted on the floor of this House for appropriations to help them. How do we stand in the United States from the standpoint of something to eat? We have 3½ acres of good agricultural land for every man, woman, and child in the United States, figuring that we have a population of 150,000,000. What would we have in the United States if we were crowded like Asia is crowded? Instead of having 150,000,000 people in the United States to live off of our soil we would then have more than 1,300,000,000 people in the United States to live off of our soil. If we should double our population and add 1,000,000,000 people to it, then we would be in the condition that Asia is in today, and today in the United States we have some unemployment even with only 150,000,000. Today in the United States we do not have enough houses with only 150,000,000 people. What in God's name would we have if we had 1,300,000,000 people in the United States to live off our soil instead of the 150,000,000 that we do have? Why are we the greatest Nation in the world? Because God almighty gave us so many natural resources in the beginning that with all of our profligacy, with all of our waste, with all of our disregard for our natural resources, we have not been able to dissipate all of it yet. That is the reason we are the greatest Nation in the world today. Providence just gave this United States of America so much that in 175 years we have not been able to tear it all up and throw it all away, but we are doing a pretty good job of it. We have lost half of our topsoil already, that little black film of topsoil from 8 to 18 inches thick spread over this United States, that carries less than 10 percent of the relationship to the solid content of this earth that the varnish carries to the solid content of a globe. When it is gone, we are gone.

China saw the day when they had no idea that 50,000,000 people would starve

in 1 year in that country. India saw the time when they said, "We have lots of soil. Our river valleys are fertile. There is no reason why we should ever be hungry." But we are following the very same road that has been followed by every nation of antiquity.

I have heard men say on the floor of this House that the soil is the problem of the American farmer, that it does not concern anybody else; why does not the farmer himself take care of his own soil? I wish it were that simple.

We do have farm prosperity in the United States compared with some of the conditions we have had in the past, but I want you to remember this, and these figures are fresh. They came from the Department of Agriculture yesterday:

In 1949, with approximately 6,000,000 farm families in the United States, 1½ million of those farm families had a cash income for last year of less than \$225 per family. The next one and one-fifth million families had a cash income of \$705 per family. The third group of one and one-fifth million families had a cash income of \$1,425 per family. The fourth group of one and one-fifth million families had an income per family of \$2,775, and the highest bracket group, the highest income group of families engaged in agriculture, one and one-fifth million of them, had an income per family of five, of \$9,870, and that just about reaches the average nonfarm income of the United States.

That is one of the reasons the farmer cannot stand the entire burden of soil conservation if it is going to be done in time to save the soil of the United States. We are doing the job but we are not doing it fast enough. I can tell you how fast we are doing it. I have checked the figures. That is one thing I do know about.

We have terraced, in God knows how many years, 20,000,000 acres of land in the United States. That is all the Soil Conservation Service has terraced plus what PMA has terraced, plus what individual farmers like myself have terraced, all working together. We have built terraces to protect 20,000,000 acres of land in the United States, and there are another 100,000,000 acres that need that protection and need it now. Yet we appropriate \$282,000,000 a year to do the job, and we send \$100,000,000 to Korea, we send \$100,000,000 to China, and we send enough money to implement the Marshall plan in Europe to build every mile of terrace that needs to be built in the United States. Then we come down to \$282,000,000 for the one thing this Nation needs most of all, soil conservation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very much interested in the speech the distinguished gentleman from Missouri is making, because he is talking along a line which I am sure he knows I have a very deep interest in. As a matter of fact the gentleman knows that these vast deficits we are incurring go on the national debt. Is that not true?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman feel that any program which involves agriculture should do something for future generations who are going to be called upon to pay that obligation?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Unless we do something for the soil of the United States—soil which we do not own—we just have a life tenure on it—no farmer owns the farm he lives on. When he dies it falls into the lap of the nearest probate judge—he just has a life tenure on it. If we are not careful the father will not leave anything to the son but a sheet of subsoil covered by nothing but a mortgage.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in what he says, but it seems to me when we are contemplating drawing out of the Treasury of the United States billions of dollars to finance this farm plan or that farm plan by way of the Brannan route or by way of the present route, the fact remains, unless we are able to step up and amplify tremendously the soil conservation, tree planting, and reforestation programs in this country we are going to leave a legacy to the people who come after you and me and their great-grandchildren which will be an obligation for them to pay with no corresponding benefit to them—benefits which would result if we stepped up this soil conservation, tree planting and reforestation program. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his contribution. Let me also state to him we are not trying to discuss the Brannan plan this evening because I am talking about soil conservation. I have a statement I want to make if the gentleman will permit me and I will proceed with that statement now. At some future time we will discuss the Brannan plan at great length probably.

As I was saying a few minutes ago, farming is not a corporate enterprise. Farming is a means of sustenance. It is a way of life. Perhaps a dozen corporations could take over the agriculture of the United States and conserve the soil and operate more efficiently than the 6,000,000 farmers who are living on that soil today, but I do not want to live to see the day when that happens. I believe in the family-sized farm and the people who live on those farms because they love the soil and they love the livestock and love the work they do. They would not stay out there if they did not.

Let me tell you a few of the things that go on on the farm. First I want you folks to visit a field with me. Maybe in this House where we talk about foreign countries—where we talk about armies and where we talk about navies and where we talk about the Air Force and our State Department and our great banking institutions and the tariff and such things as that that really amount to something—maybe a field is an anticlimax. But we live out of those fields and any time we do not live out of those fields we will not live at all. So I want to ask you folks to visit a field with me,

if you can, in your mind, I would like for you to go back to 1895—5 years before the turn of this century. Go with me and my old father to visit a field. There are only 25 acres in this particular field. Its only importance lies in the fact that its prototypes are in every community in this country. Oh, in 1895 the soil in that field was 2 feet deep. It was nice black, sand loam and the leaf mold was laying over that field so that you could walk with no more noise than you make on this rug as your footsteps passed over those rotten leaves on top of the ground.

The first time I saw that field was in late June, and the mulberries were ripe. The young squirrels were ripe, too. My father was an old squirrel hunter. He learned to hunt squirrels in southern Indiana, not long after the Civil War. I went with him to that Missouri field. It was a flat 10 acres, and then a hill that covered about 15 acres. The hickory trees stood there, the black walnut, and the mulberry trees full of mulberries that the squirrels were eating in late June. I walked around the tree while father stood still. The squirrel went around the other side of the tree and he would motion me to stop when the squirrel came around and he would shoot the squirrel. I pulled the grape vines that ran up to their nests that were made with green leaves, and I carried the squirrels. That field was like God had laid it down there. But that farm changed hands. Father and I went down there a few years later to that field, and a sawmill had been set in there. Every tree that would make a few boards had been felled, and the logs taken out and sawed up. There was a pile of sawdust on the creek bank, and the mill was gone. The owner of that field said to the folks who lived out on the prairies, "I have got wood down here. If you will come down here and clean it up, I will give it to you." So the neighbors came and cleaned it up, and he went in there with what we called a jumping shovel plow. You pushed down on the handles to make it go into the ground. He dug up a little loose dirt in there and he planted corn and pumpkins. Then in the fall he cut that corn up and shocked it. You could almost step from one yellow pumpkin to another. The corn made 50 bushels to the acre and a wagonload of pumpkins or more on every acre in addition. That shows you what kind of soil it was.

Well, it was farmed in corn a few years, and then they sawed the stumps off level and sowed it to wheat, and it made 35 bushels to the acre without fertilizer. I helped thresh it.

Go look at that field today. I can carry in one of my hands all of the black soil that is left on that 25 acres. There are gashes down the side of that hill 6 feet deep into the red clay. It will never raise another bushel of corn. Never in the memory of any man living today or any child living today will it ever grow another bushel of corn. It cannot even be seeded to grass. It is absolutely ruined for all time.

It is only 25 acres. What is the difference? Just this difference. It is part of the United States of America, and today that 25 acres, properly handled, could have been producing beef and pork,

milk, eggs, or wheat; but it is ruined. The man that owned it did not know enough to take care of it. The name of such men today is legion. Some men can take care of their farms and do not do it. Others can and do, and others absolutely cannot do it.

Let us go out into the country. Here is a young farmer. We will say he is a GI. He has saved up a thousand dollars, and he makes a down payment on a little piece of land. He has to buy the cheapest piece of land in the neighborhood so as to have enough money to make the down payment on it, and he borrows the rest. He has to pay a little insurance. He has to pay a little taxes, and he has to meet the payments on his home. He goes out to these fields that ought to be terraced. They ought to be limed. They ought to be fertilized. They ought to be sown in clover. But what can he do? He has not got the money to do it. He has to go out to those fields and say, "I have got to deplete you still more in order that I may ever own you."

That is one case. Here is another man. He owns 160 acres of good land that has been taken care of. He has two sons and two daughters. One of his sons is already in the city. The two daughters are married and moved away. There is one boy left at home with dad. That one boy would like to have the farm. Dad lays down and dies; the two girls come home and the son comes home; they are interested in the estate. The boy who wants to stay on that farm does what? What little money he has saved up he spends to buy dad's tractor and some of the cows that sell at the sale. Two or three days later he goes into town, goes down to the loan company, and mortgages that farm for 75 or 80 percent of its value to pay Susie and Jean and Bob in order that he may stay on that farm. Then he goes out to those fields, and he says to them: "I cannot take care of you any longer; I have got to mine you to the uttermost. I want to own you some day, and in order to do that I have got to abuse you." And suppose about the time he gets it paid for that the work has disgusted him with farming and he goes to town and he says to the real-estate man: "Sell my farm; I am not going to stay on it any more." Another man comes along with 25 percent of the price of that farm and mortgages it for the rest. He goes out to the land and says: "You have paid Joe; now pay me." Do you see the reason that the farm land of the United States is being destroyed? The time has got to come in these United States—and now you may choose to call me a Communist if you want to, and if you do, just crack away; I have been called everything but a gentleman anyhow, so you cannot insult me. The time has got to come in this Nation when a deed to a tract of land will not carry with it the right to destroy that tract of land. Now, I do not know what you are going to make out of that statement, but it has got to come.

Take the case of a man who lives on 160 acres of land but is no longer able to operate it; his children are gone, there is nobody there at home any more, and he moves to town and rents a little house;

he gets out to the farm only twice a year, and the only interest he has in the farm is the number of dollars it will bring him every year in order that he and his wife may live. That farm is going down and being depleted.

Then there is the last proposition that I am going to take up with you in this part of this program, and that is the man who buys a farm for an investment. There are still plenty of people in the United States who think that if you want to get rich just buy yourself a farm, rent it out, and live off the rent. That is very disappointing to the landlord and it is very bad on the farm. Now I want to talk about this little graph here.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he discusses that graph?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. I was interested a moment ago when the gentleman stated that the time is coming when an owner of land or the holder of a deed would not be permitted to do as he wished with his land. What solution does the gentleman have to offer? What sort of control or regulation does the gentleman propose whereby the owner would be compelled to practice good soil conservation policies in connection with his land?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I think the time will have to come in these United States when the farmer will have to be required to terrace the land that needs terracing, to spread lime on land that needs to be limed, and when he will not be allowed to plant it all to corn, to plant it all to cotton, or to plant it all to tobacco; he will have to observe good farming practices. I realize it will raise the devil whenever it is proposed, but we have either got to do that or the time is going to come in these United States when the production of our farms will not feed half of our population. I believe it.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is making a very interesting speech here this evening, and I am sure that every Member present is thoroughly enjoying it. Is it not true that at this time, while the regulation is not compulsory, we do have regulations which require farmers to comply with certain practices in order to obtain soil-conservation payments and benefits? This is an effort to induce him to follow good farming practices. So what the gentleman is suggesting now is that ultimately the time will have to come when he will be obliged to do that.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The only thing that will keep him from being compelled to do that is the chance that he will do it without compulsion, and that is what I am hoping for.

Mr. PRESTON. I quite agree that it is an educational program that we must follow up vigorously if we are ever to get put into effect the things the gentleman so strongly recommends.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is right, and I want to say that the PMA program in the United States is the program that has gotten more soil conservation for the money than any program we have ever had in the United States. It makes soil

conservation semicompulsory. It says: We make the payments if you do these things; if you do not, we will not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take up this graph. A man comes into a town, let us say, and he buys a hardware store. He has money to pay for the building and a stock of goods. His shelves are full. Let us say he has enough money in addition to buy a residence in town for him and his family. He has had business experience. He knows where to buy advantageously. He can mix with the public well. His wife and children get along well with all the folks in town. He and his wife are social successes. He gets along all right. Let us give him every break.

Well, he has to make enough money to pay his help, he has to make enough money to pay his taxes, he has to make enough money to pay for his water and lights, he has to make enough money to support his family, he has to make enough money to help support the institutions that are in his town because if he is going to be a businessman there he has to be one of them, he is going to act like one of them, he is going to spend money like one of them. Let us say he makes enough money to do all of those things.

But when he takes inventory on the first day of January after he has owned that store 10 months, he finds his stock of goods lacks \$5,000 of invoicing as much as when he bought the store. He has made enough money to do everything else, but he has not made enough money to replenish the goods on his shelf. Now, if he continues to do that, is it not a fact that at the end of a certain number of years he will either sell a depleted stock at a sacrifice, for whatever he can get, or he will be forced into bankruptcy? One of those two things await him. Now we are going to bring a farmer into that community and let him buy 160 acres of land or a half section if that suits you better. Let us give him every break. Let us let him pay cash down for his farm and let him have \$3,000 or \$4,000 over and above his stock and implements to buy fuel, oil, and food and fertilizer until he can harvest his first crop. Let him make enough money to pay all of his expenses excepting to put that calcium, nitrogen, phosphorous, and potash back into his soil. If he does not make enough money to do that, or if he fails to do that and continues to crop that ground year after year, his end is the same as the merchant's.

He does not know it; maybe his neighbors do not know it; maybe they will say that the man is making a success. He is meeting all of his obligations; he is educating his children; he is keeping his home in repair. But what is happening out in those fields? There is where he will succeed or fail out in those fields. Look at the graph. Note the mineral content of 40 bushels of corn. Note these figures represent the mineral content of 40 bushels of corn. These figures do not take into consideration the plant food lost by leaching or erosion on the acre of land during the year in which that acre was producing that 40 bushels of corn. In many cases an acre of land producing

40 bushels of corn loses twice as much plant food by leaching and erosion as the 40 bushels of corn contain. The mineral content of the 40 bushels of corn is 45 pounds of calcium, 60 pounds of nitrogen, 20 pounds of phosphorus, and 50 pounds of potash. Again notice the graph, 20 bushels of wheat contain 48 pounds of calcium, 36 pounds of nitrogen, 15 pounds of phosphorus, and 20 pounds of potash; and 2½ tons of alfalfa contain 73 pounds of calcium, 70 pounds of nitrogen, 23 pounds of phosphorus, and 113 pounds of potash. Many farmers say that alfalfa improves land; that is not true. Note the minerals that a crop of alfalfa removes from the soil; unless they are replaced the alfalfa will fail. It will simply starve to death.

The oil driller receives a depletion allowance because he is depleting his natural resources; that allowance is often as great as 27½ percent. The same is true of the mining industry. But some folks consider the soil as eternal and the farmer is allowed no deduction for depletion. I tell you that the people of these United States have got to wake up.

Mr. Bennett, of the Soil Conservation Service, says that we are losing enough of our topsoil every day to put topsoil 12 inches deep on 8,000 acres of land every day, and that 1,000 acres of land goes out of the mouth of the Mississippi, in the Delta down there, when the Mississippi is at full flood, every 24 hours. How long can we stand that with our soil going down and our population going up? It is time and high time that the people of the United States and the Government of the United States woke up to the fact that soil conservation is the greatest need of the country at the present time and that our loss of topsoil is our greatest misfortune. The PMA program has taught the American farmer and helped him financially in a program of terracing and liming and has done more for actual soil conservation accomplished in the fields than all other programs combined. Every dollar of taxpayers' money that has been spent by PMA has already returned to the Federal Treasury in income taxes paid by farmers who would never have made enough money to pay an income tax had it not been for the PMA program. The appropriation for the PMA program should be raised to \$400,000,000 per year. The two greatest needs today are lime and terraces. Terraces to protect the body of the soil itself and lime to increase the growth of legumes. Money spent for soil conservation is not an expense but the best investment the taxpayers of the United States have ever made or ever will make because it helps guarantee food, clothing, and shelter not only for themselves but for their children and grandchildren.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this is Patriots' Day in Massachusetts. We

from the old Bay State are grateful to the Congress for the concurrent resolution commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the battles of Lexington and Concord.

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood" the farmers and townfolk stood up to the professional soldiers of Britain and gave such a good account of themselves that the spirit of revolt was sparked throughout the Thirteen Colonies.

They fought against taxation without representation and it might be well for us in 1950 to remember that excessive taxation stirred the colonists to rebellion in 1775. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that many of our citizens might consider themselves as long-suffering colonists today and rise up—in political protest—if we do not give them a dollar's worth for every one of the billions of dollars which this Congress will appropriate.

As we honor the patriots of Concord and Lexington let us be mindful of the fact that the spirit which motivated them is not absent from their descendants of today.

Although the functions of Government have increased in order to balance the social and economic tensions in modern society, there is a limit to the extension of such powers.

The colonist of 1775 put his home or his farm first—of a value far more important than the Government he and his fellow citizens established to maintain law and order.

There are vast differences between the agricultural—almost pastoral quality of life in 1775—and the feverish tempo of our complex times.

But people were human beings then, as they are now. They have individual needs and wants and aspirations that require a climate in which there will be some opportunity for realization.

It is necessary for us to provide them with some protection against the economic hazards of modern life. But there is some danger in our preoccupation with security that may lead us to neglect opportunity. Our approach may become negative, rather than positive.

That is why the events that we commemorate this day are of such value to us. They remind us of the courage and self-reliance which made this Nation great. This is no time for us to rest upon the efforts of those who preceded us. This Nation has not reached the age of retirement. The worth of any people is measured less by its material achievements than by the growth of its intelligence and its character.

We cannot go back to those stirring days when men first tasted the fresh air of freedom. We would not want to go back. There are more of the good things of life to enjoy today.

But we of today need the spiritual fulfillment which was theirs.

It will not be found in complete dependence upon others.

When we finally complete the job of providing basic economic security for our people, I hope that we will then concentrate on bending every effort to encourage them with incentives.

This is the miracle ingredient in our way of life: the one that inspires extra effort and extra satisfaction.

The men and women of Concord and Lexington had it in abundance. We, in the years ahead that will test us as never before, will need this self-reliance at its best. For the whole is only the sum of the individual parts of which it is made. So, too, with a nation.

I pray that our people on this Patriot's Day and on every holiday that calls to mind our glorious past, will determine not only to emulate but to excel in the sturdy virtues of courage and individual effort for which there is no substitute.

That is the lesson to be learned from Concord and Lexington.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MARSHALL), for this week, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. SHEPPARD), for 10 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. BEALL), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 18, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1387. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 4, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, Chariton River and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 16, 1945, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 561), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4969. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army

to transfer and convey certain lands and thereby facilitate administration and give proper cognizance to the highest use of United States lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5913. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ross County, Ohio, for lands within the Symmes Creek purchase unit in Lawrence County, Ohio, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3169. A bill for the relief of Agustin Cortés Martínez, his wife Guillermina Díaz de Cortés, his children Santiago Cortés Díaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortés Díaz, and Guillermino Augustin Cortés Díaz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6169. A bill for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6652. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier; with amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7065. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana; with amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7066. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Amano; with amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 8103. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 8104. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 8105. A bill to extend until July 1, 1951, import control powers with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8106. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8107. A bill to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8108. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide

minimum annuity payments for certain officers, employees, and widows; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 8109. A bill to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8110. A bill to amend Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, chapter 681, first session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8111. A bill to amend Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, chapter 681, first session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8112. A bill to provide for the transfer to the States of the replicas of the State seals removed from the Chamber of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8113. A bill relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT (by request):

H. R. 8114. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1937 (ch. 443, 50 Stat. 478), and to provide for the retirement of certain noncitizen employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 8115. A bill for the relief of Dr. C. A. Schenck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 8116. A bill for the relief of Arthur N. Forsmark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 8117. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Emory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNOS-ISERN:

H. R. 8118. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Ismael Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 8119. A bill for the relief of Midori Ohta (also known as Mary Stephen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 8120. A bill for the relief of Anite Clara Taube; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8121. A bill providing for the payment of \$810.50 to George W. Purdy, of Oak Bluffs, Mass., in settlement of claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8122. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. 2,094,279, issued September 28, 1937, relating to rubber rail seats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 8123. A bill for the relief of Lee Yee Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 8124. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 8125. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hisae Kawauchi Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2071. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of the Cambridge Woman's Club, Cambridge, Md., in opposition to compulsory health insurance legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2072. Also, resolution of the Cambridge Rotary Club, Cambridge, Md., in opposition to compulsory health insurance legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2073. By Mr. RICH: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary Post No. 519, Westfield, Pa., in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2074. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the members of the Twentieth Century Study Club, of Beloit, Wis., opposing any form of socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., pastor, National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Create in us clean hearts, O Lord, and renew right spirits within us. Make sacred this day and all its duties that it may be lived as unto Thee.

Judge us in the secret places of the soul and in the public ordering of our lives. Make us wise enough and strong enough and great enough and good enough to be fit stewards of the devices and the destinies which, by Thy providence, now rest in our hands. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 19, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 19, 1950:

S. 46. An act for the relief of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz;

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as executive director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; and

S. 2734. An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

On April 20, 1950:

S. 2246. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KILGORE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, Friday and Saturday of this week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Connor
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Sparkman
Cordon	Kilgore	Stennis
Darby	Knowland	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Douglas	Leahy	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Tydings
Eastland	Lodge	Watkins
Eaton	Lucas	Wherry
Ellender	McCarran	Wiley
Ferguson	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McFarland	Withers
Frear	McKellar	Young
Fulbright	McMahon	
Green	Magnuson	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. The bill is open to amendment.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions.